5-2021

Side by Side: Allyship's Rhetorical Construction in University LGBT Resource Center "Safe Space" Training Manuals

Chad Kuehn
St Cloud State University, ctkuehn@stcloudstate.edu

Side by Side: Allyship's Rhetorical Construction in University LGBT Resource Center "Safe Space" Training Manuals

by

Chad Kuehn

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts in

English: Writing Studies and Rhetoric

May, 2021

Thesis Committee:
Daniel L. Wildeson, Chair
Catherine O. Fox
Tim R. Fountaine
Brandon L. Johnson

Abstract

While university LGBT resource centers work to educate, enable, and embolden members of the LGBTQIA+ community themselves, there is also important work for resource centers in building bridges to, and understanding within, greater campus and greater community populations. Our paper explores the rhetorical construction used by university LGBT resource center Safe Space training manuals to develop understanding, compassion, activism—allyship and allies—in resource center communities, populations potentially both inside and outside that of the university LGBTQIA+ community proper. As many LGBT resource centers have been founded on texts that unintentionally promote hetero- and homonormative ways of being, current Safe Space manuals may not address queer community intragroup allyship, and therefore the many embodiments of queer experience—ignoring potential for ally development, and perpetuating singular understandings of the ally, and the queer individual. In Side by Side we've examined who university Safe Space manuals address, how invitations to support the LGBTQIA+ community are presented, and the frames used to develop allies and change views of the LGBTQIA+ community. Through examination of recent iterations of one university's Safe Space manuals and interviews with its recent LGBT Resource Center directors, the study found that while understandings of "ally" and the queer community have changed in recent decades, that resource center manuals have not, maintaining focus rather on intergroup allies as vital and privileged players in queer and trans causes. Implications of this stagnation and possible enhancements of the rhetoricity of the resource center's Safe Space manuals are discussed.

Acknowledgments

To the Directors of LGBT Resource Centers across the nation and the world in their struggle to make space for the LGBTQIA+ community, and to the sincere efforts of LGBTQIA+ community allies, be they inter- or intragroup: our community, and this researcher, would not be where they are today without each of you. Thank you.

To my committee chair, Dr. Dan Wildeson, who through strokes of mutual interest and serendipity went on this journey with me this year. May all allies have the heart and introspection that you do. Thank you.

To my committee members, Dr. Catherine Fox, Dr. Timothy Fountaine, and Mr. Brandon Johnson for their time and insights. Thank you.

To the LGBT Directors who shared their time and thoughts in interviews with me, this study would have been myopic without you. For your work in this project, and for the direction and passion you have given to your LGBT Resource Centers, thank you.

And to Dr. Kyoto Kishimoto who taught me to see “ally” as nuanced, and who created the line of questioning for this study in my mind. Thank you.

Side by Side is dedicated to those with the fortitude to stand alongside another with tenacity, integrity, and humility.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter I: Introduction

Introduction

Born happy, loved, naive, white, cisgender, and male in Small-Town, U.S.A., it took this researcher some time to recognize many of the injustices we find in our world today. It wasn't until adolescence, as he came into his sexuality and recognized himself as gay, that these inconsistencies became more personal. Although empathetic, it was even later when the irregularities drew into stronger relief and began to reveal the intricacies of intersectionality and oppression he himself had been spared. While he recognized himself as disadvantaged in status as "queer," he began to recognize his privilege in status as "white," "cisgender," and "male," and began to hold aspirations to ally his intersectional neighbors in the LGBTQIA+ community—to make queer life more whole for all of us.

This lack of "wholeness" is marked by any marginalized population's need for an identity and a community—literal places and figurative spaces—in which to live on their own terms. Barring this creation, they live at the whims of the majority, subject to the definitions dominant groups construct for minority populations in maintenance of the status quo. Minority positionings have key, and continuously overlooked, concerns to address—but as marginalized populations, don't always readily have access to the power needed to efficiently, fully voice those concerns. LGBT Resource Centers strive to provide such spaces and resources for their queer and transgender communities, and allies and ally aid are vital resources centers might want to organize and leverage. As implied by the concept of the term, however, one must recognize that allies have not experienced the oppression of in-group members. In addition, ally participation can at times be troublesome to a cause and its in-group constituents, and a marginalized individual's perception of safe space through allies' eyes, or perception of safe

space as allowed by an "ally," is not one's own space or truly safe at all—but rather a maintenance of hegemony.

It is in working to continue developing understandings of the ally and the ally's space within a cause that we turn to the construction of the "ally" identity in Safe Space training manuals. It is with contemplation of the complexities of allyship that we hope LGBT resource center directors endeavor to write their manuals, constructing a nuanced concept of "ally" with rhetorical sophistication that will challenge both hetero- and homonormative understandings of our world. And it is with an appreciation and concern for the compounded effects of oppression on many queer community friends, family, and members that we offer Side by Side as a contemplation on the concept of "ally" and how each of us can contribute to safe spaces for all members of the LGBTQIA+ community.

In Side by Side, we present several concepts for LGBT resource center administrators to ponder in developing contemplative and responsive allies: Identity; Alterity; Space; Allyship and Privilege; and Invention, Framing and Keying, and Screens. We also present analyses of one university LGBT resource center's Safe Space manual, and the views of several of that center's directors on allies and allyship in relation to the manual. We hope that consideration of these concepts and analyses will allow development of iteratively more rhetorically complicated resource center manuals, and similarly complicated concepts of the queer community and its intersectionalities, and finally, of the complexity of the community's allies.

Chapter II: Statement of Problem

When addressing ideological assertions as a marginalized population, an ally can add valuable voice. In discussion involving identity, however, questions may arise as to who that ally is, and what their motivations are, as they are not an in-group member. Allies can play crucial roles, garnering an audience that in-group members of the maligned community might not engage on their own. The question stands, however, as to how allies view themselves and the groups they support. Do allies rally with altruistic motives, or with a need to be seen and heard, whether or not the cause is truly "theirs"? Do they attend with an understanding of the background and experience inherent to in-group counterparts? Considering the imbalance of power often found between allies and the communities they would befriend, it is worth considering who the ally is, who they perceive themself to be, and what they consider to be their roles and their goals.

Illustrated by relatively low numbers of campuses offering LGBT resource centers, there remains a need for greater LGBTQIA+ student support, and increasing allyship in campus communities (both campus proper, and the community at large) likely interests center directors. Today in the U.S., "10-15% of U.S. institutions of higher education" have an LGBT Resource Center, "as of March 2019, there are still eight states that have no institutions with an LGBT student center and nine that only have one institution with a center statewide" (LGBT student center)—so every ally and opportunity can expand community.

As an ally's inculcation into a new role will likely heavily inflect how they perform that role, we propose that a careful and intentional construction of the "ally" identity is vital in LGBT resource center materials, and that iterative examination of Safe Space Manuals' (SSMs) rhetorical construction bringing allies into being is advisable. Previous study by Jen Self in

"Queering Center" suggests that many LGBT resource centers have ideologies founded from three texts whose teachings have not eliminated homonormative concepts of the queer community (2-6), thus exploration of existing resource center materials and language may reveal opportunities for more inclusive, nuanced rhetorical constructions of queer and ally communities.

Current conceptualizations of "ally" in research reflect a similarly limited hetero- and homonormative view. While research into allies and allyship, intersectionality, LGBTQIA+ community and support, and ally training exist—the search for shades of allyship, among LGBTQIA+ persons, recognizing intersectionalities—is limited. For instance, studies by Ji et al., and Ellen Broido research allies—but both cases focus research on heterosexual manifestations of "ally." Broido's participants were all heterosexual by chance, but she also works with a definition of "ally" that defines "social justice allies" as "members of dominant social groups" (3). Ji et al. conduct research around teaching—heterosexuals specifically—to be allies.

Likewise, Kearns et al. in a study of pre-service educators, discuss, without mention of homonormativity, the necessity of a mandatory course if students are to be able to create "safe spaces for...LGBTQ youth and allies in schools...and to interrupt heteronormativity" (1). Rebekah Byrd and Danica Hays evaluate Safe Space training for school counselors to determine "the relationship between LGBTQ competency and awareness of sexism and heterosexism" (20). Allies in these cases seem to come from outside the queer community itself, and focus on traditional heteronormative concerns rather than broader intersectional concerns as well.

In an overview of research into ally training programs on campuses, Woodford et al. describe many trainings, none of which note intersectionality or "in-group" allyship as focuses. When contributing schools spoke of training audience, the audience was described only in terms

of "students, staff, and faculty," not with in-group or out-group distinctions as well (318). While Woodford et al. also discuss the role of an ally and call for a "clear and consistent" "conceptualization" of the ally, their discussion does not address ally identity, focusing on active and passive advocate interpretations, or individually or institutionally focused efforts instead (319-21).

One exception to research positioning allyship external to the queer community is the research of Hayley McGlashan and Katie Fitzpatrick who describe their work's value: "Despite a wealth of research in education on the exclusion of young people at the intersection of gender, sexuality and other identity positions, there is very little research that reports on school-wide health promotion initiatives that both engage [these intersectional] young people as leaders and participants in their schools, and work towards creating safe and empowering spaces for LGBTQ youth" (483). Here we see one study's focus on the potential for intersectionality and in-group allyship, on autonomy and agency. As a high school though, this school falls outside our scope, university campus training.

Without access to the intent of each study's authors, some interpretation is made as to how the authors' language shapes the ally as one from outside the LGBTQIA+ experience. Common reference among the studies to concepts of understanding "the LGBT experience," hearing "their stories," and supporting "them" would seem to support this interpretation however. But if this liberty reaches too far, the ambiguity of audience and "ally" at least illustrates a need for language to better describe allies of broader types. This study hopes to propose additional language surrounding "ally," and to help address the gap in conversation surrounding allies, allyship, and ally training.

To begin considering this gap, we note that member of the queer community or not, allies—no matter how well-intentioned—by definition do not have the experiences of those they represent. This is true in "intergroup" allyship (allyship from outside a community proper), but equally true in "intragroup" allyship (support from inside the community). For instance, in the queer community there is possibility for an ally to be part of the community, but to have quite different experiences from their queer counterparts—a lesbian woman, for instance, cannot inhabit the experience of a transgender man, even when assuming the divergence of their identities ends here. Each experiences a gap in first-person understanding of the other's path through life, although they both exist within the queer community. This gap grows wider as we consider intersectional experiences—if the lesbian woman is also a woman of color and the transgender man is white and uses a wheelchair for mobility, we see how their catch-all "queer" experiences may be inflected differently by misogyny, ableism, or racism, and vary starkly—and then how their ability to fundamentally understand one another will be challenged. Considering this span between ally and allied, there will also be a distance between the language used to identify, conceptualize, and situate one group as opposed to the other. Understanding Safe Space manual audiences are most often heterogeneous: some non-queer members, some homonormatively queer members, some queer members with intersectional concerns—and recalling Self's finding that LGBT resource center materials are often based on homonormative concepts, our study evaluates any existence of an unintentional construction of "ally" in SSMs as solely intergroup and intended for a homogenous audience. A construction which, if present, could be expanded to catalyze intragroup allyship, and ebb homonormative interpretation of queer community subjectivities.

Therefore, since rhetoric plays a crucial role in how we understand our identity and the identity of those around us, in a university LGBT resource center—which is ideally acutely aware of language's ability to shape experience—how might one harness language's great power in evolving campus community perceptions through training manuals? How do leaders of LGBT resource centers create materials encouraging support that recognizes space between queer community member and intergroup ally, and that addresses intersectionalities and power all while encouraging advocacy—and do they, in fact, do so? To investigate such queries, we posit three research questions:

1. How do university LGBT resource centers rhetorically construct concepts of "ally" in their audience through ally training manual language?

2. What rationale informs university LGBT resource center language and design of ally training manuals' construction of "allyship"?

3. What recommendations supported by rhetorical concepts can strengthen university LGBT resource centers' ally training manuals, and therefore, trainings?

This study explores how the LGBT Resource Center at a regional, four-year university in the U.S. Midwest has constructed the concept of "ally" in its Safe Space manual. The study will explore center language as found in the manual, and the intent behind that language through interviews with LGBT Resource Center directors.

As the Center:

- last updated its Safe Space manual around 10 years ago,
- is celebrating its 20th anniversary,
- is part of a campus focused by an "It's Time" initiative seeking to redefine itself with "a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion" (Wacker),

- and finally, because it shares similar challenges with the BLM movement and current civil unrest surrounding allies, their identities, and their participation,

the time is ripe for the LGBT Resource Center to revisit its commitments to its community proper, its mission, and its relationship with its allies as brought to life by SSM language.

Dominant group allies have often spoken for (or over) their counterparts. Allies to the queer community, and the community itself, have all been facilely and monolithically defined. "Allyship" is also often imagined as only intergroup support of in-group members while intragroup tensions rather than cooperation may bud—thus there is a need to problematize these interpretations and relationships. Side by Side offers a codification of language constructing "ally" that may improve regulation of privilege and better serve future LGBT resource center programs, reveal areas where that language may be used with more rhetorical sophistication, and recognize where directors have already made critical and careful choices to benefit the queer community, and all positionalities of its allies in SSM construction.

Chapter III: Background of the Problem

Considering Self's finding of potential for homonormative conceptualizations in LGBT resource center foundings and materials, we turn to several topics that could complicate concepts of a homonormative and singular queer community, the intergroup ally, and of the relationships between the queer community and its allies. The following discussion is not exhaustive, but begins illustrating the rhetorical complexity of a less-assuming construction of the ally and the queer community, should a resource center find need to address their current materials or mission. After discussion of these topics, we will look at the methodology of Side by Side to evaluate the current construction of "ally" in the subject university's Safe Space manual, followed by an analysis of the study's findings. As background for our upcoming analyses and discussion, let's look now at "Identity," "Alterity," "Space," "Allyship and Privilege," and "Invention, Framing and Keying, and Terministic Screens" in relation to the Safe Space manual.

Identity

Central to Side by Side's investigation is agreement upon the concept of the "ally" identity—who an ally is and what they do. Upon working through the Safe Space manual in the course of an ally training, an attendee ideally emerges a new queer community "ally" prepared to create "safe space" within their communities. The new title may be filled with assumption in terms of ally identity, however.

In consideration of the ally, we look to Kenneth Burke who offers a simple statement concerning group identifications belying its own complexity: "A is not identical with his colleague, B" (*Rhetoric of Motives* 20). While certainly true, in allyship we work to close the gulf that occurs between two non-identical colleagues or communities and may imagine we succeed in eradicating differences that exist. We assume that while we may not be identical, that

we, in this case, are motivated by the same goals: queer community safety and happiness. While "A" and "B" may not be identical, "...insofar as their interests are joined, A is *identified* with B," and "To identify A with B is to make A 'consubstantial' with B" (*Rhetoric of Motives* 20-1). In allyship we experience consubstantiality, an overarching unity of goal, in either intergroup or intragroup allyship. To not only investigate how an LGBT resource center constructs that concept of "ally," and motivations for an ally in heterogeneous company is important then, but also to determine what is occurring in that consubstantiality, whom it serves—and what center leadership constructions of "ally" can do to redirect or focus that service as necessary. Other important considerations will be how participation shapes our own identity, and how identities imbalanced by power may affect one another in a participative community such as a SST (e.g. how privilege functions in the manuals, or in real world ally/community interactions).

Etienne Wenger conceives of participation, engagement with another, as a construct of one's identity. In *Communities of Practice*, he explores the meaning we make in our lives through participation, "a defining characteristic of participation is the possibility of developing an 'identity of participation,' that is, an identity constituted through relations of participation...In this regard, what I take to characterize participation is the possibility of mutual recognition...In this experience of mutuality, participation is a source of identity. By recognizing the mutuality of our participation, we become part of each other" (56). What does an ally do if not "participate"? Through Wenger, we see how allies ask to participate in new communities, and to enter into an "ally" identity, they must be recognized by the community with whom they would ally. Examination of a resource center manual's facilitation of that entry into a community, and its recognition of allies by the queer community (as represented by the ethos of the center), will help

determine the positioning and privilege at play in a heterogeneous manual audience. It will help determine how the manual constructs "ally" for a reader.

That said, when presumably well-intentioned, but overzealous, participation from an out-group member moves from allyship toward cooptation or saviorship, we see not mutual recognition, but self-assertion, not a consubstantial identity, but an identity that never departed from "individual." Here, Wenger adds a caveat to participation noting, "[participative] mutuality does not, however, entail equality or respect. The relations...are mutual in the sense that participants shape each other's experiences of meaning...But these are not relations of equality" (56). That is not to say that the relations *can't* be equal or entail respect—but to say that they do not inherently do so, especially in a hegemonic society such as ours. Although Wenger's discussion of participation and identity points to acceptance from the in-group as a necessity, it also notes that privilege maintains, and must be accounted for. This consideration underscores the importance of a carefully and intentionally constructed SSM "ally," and guidelines for the performance of "ally" by all potential allies recognizing privilege, power dynamics, and also engendering respect.

Both Burke and Wenger probe the ally's identity as neither separate from their cause, nor completely subsumed by it. Aspects of "ally" and "out-group member" identities will blend, and many will remain separate indefinitely—in this liminality the ally exists perpetually, illustrating the complexity of the "ally" identity. Contemplating this existence both removed from one's own positioning, but not fully accepted into another positioning, leads us into a consideration of alterity, of the "other"—of how an LGBT resource center manual's reference to the "other," or lack thereof, might divide two communities, or work toward a more unified identification within a consubstantiality.

Alterity

Although allies may be consubstantial, "they" may still be a "them" in the end. According to Burke's *Rhetoric of Motives*, "Identification is affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division. Identification is compensatory to division" (22). In maintaining this identification and division, we see construction of the "us" and "them" binary. Ally and allied community members will have different motivators, and may even be inclined to maintain a distinction between the groups. While this may be unnecessarily divisive at times, as Wenger has noted, it is also false to pretend that differences do not exist—but allyship finds us troubling the binary. SSMs might endeavor to teach the ally and allied how to meet in that space between. SSM construction might recognize the navigation of identity between "us" and "them," and offer guidance on how to function in such a positioning. However, if Self's discovery holds true for a manual, there will likely not be a navigation of identities, only a maintenance of "us" and "them," of intergroup allies and monolithic queer community members.

To aid in examination of what entry into an interstitial ally and in-group member "conversation" might mean, Diane Davis addresses assumptions. In discussion of Maurice Blanchot's third relation between "self" and "other"—that which deals with separation, not unity (66-8)—Davis in "Addressing Alterity" states, "Outside conversation's rapport, everything stabilizes; I operate with apparent spontaneity, and (or because) I understand you. But when you address me, you withdraw from my appropriative grasp, opening a *relation* that calls both my understanding and my sense of spontaneity into question" (200). Outside of conversation or allyship, we are free to understand the other as we will, but in engaging one another, we must navigate one another: in recruiting allies, the queer community must be prepared to move from essentialized understandings of out-group members. Allies entering a community they wish to

advocate for must do the same. Here we leave the self, and enter into consubstantiality and participation—where we complicate life, but also affect life with more meaning. To augment such work and pregnant existence, do Safe Space manuals encourage exploration of that troubled ground—reference the "we"—or only propose the ally as "you," positioned to help a queer community "them"? Do they suggest interstitial dialogue?

In conversations of allyship, it matters not only how we talk *with* one another, but also how we talk *about* one another. In an effort to reduce alterity, promote conversation, and disempower privilege in a consubstantial group, the construction of "ally" in relation to the allied is another consideration. In his "Turkish Dogs," Timothy Hampton proposes that "Tropological naming functions both rhetorically, to freeze or capture the other in figural language, and ideologically, to produce a particular culturally constructed notion of the Turks" (or, apart from Hampton's particular example, any "other" one encounters) (68). If, in constructing the concept of "ally" for Safe Space participants, the allied community is positioned only as "they," as "other," one risks creating a monolithic representation of the group which holds less potential for empathy and collaboration, and more easily leads to misunderstanding. If "ally" is not meticulously constructed in tandem with "the allied," possibilities for ally cooptation or saviorship approaches may multiply.

Given the power dominant groups already have in shaping the world we inhabit, SSMs are challenged with recognizing individual differences, reducing "us" and "them" binary thought, and constructing appropriate scope of influence for allies as they negotiate "us." As ally and allied engage one another in conversation—remove themselves from established perceptions of one another, of roles, and of environments—discussions around identities begin, as well as discussions of the space allies and the allied share.

Space

Naturally, in review of a program and manual entitled “Safe Space,” the shape and content of that space bears discussion both in this study, and in the real world of allyship. Allies will, for instance, encounter concerns of their role’s scope in the creation of safe space, what their role in that space should mean, and what that space can mean to the queer community as their own owned, enabling space. Self’s study points to historical concepts of ally and queer community that manuals often maintain which may center the intergroup ally in the creation of safe space, as well as center intergroup allies as the locus of power and embodiment of safety within them.

As “space” references figurative concepts like belonging or emotional closeness in discussions of place and space, it can also signify one’s ability to take up and affect space, one’s autonomy. Exploring such agency—limiting or eradicating the apology one’s life can become—Lisa Flores’s “Creating Discursive Space" includes discussion of Chicana feminists finding voice. Throughout the essay, Flores details the Chicana feminist’s forging of that voice, the struggle to define space and “come home” when one is, as an example, neither fully or only Mexican, nor American. In order to exist on one’s own terms, Flores argues through the example of code-switching, that Chicana feminists must act with autonomy, “with no warning and no apology” (152). “Homeless,” marginalized groups can stop apologizing, waiting for space to be given, and *make themselves* at home in the world through Flores’s approach of rejecting a mainstream definition of identity, defining the group’s own identity through a panoply of experiences, and by celebrating the entirety of the group’s culture (145-9)—by acting as they will. A review of manual construction of communities and space can explore how, and if, the text advocates for space where the queer community self-defines and explores “a panoply of

experiences," or if the ally is constructed with an understanding of predefined queer individuals as dependent upon allies. Such a review can explore if allies are constructed to understand safe space as a cooperation, but ultimately queer and trans community space—or if the manual's "safe space" is constructed with other purpose, and for groups other than the queer community itself.

In a discussion of owning one's space similar to Flores's, Eun Young Lee describes the development of "Homo Hill" (now less pejoratively just "the Hill") in Seoul, South Korea's Itaewon district. In this alley, the queer community has literally and figuratively set up shop, marking "the presence of nonheterosexuality, controverting heteronormativity by unnaturalizing the gendered space of an archetypal South Korean cityscape" (132). Safe Space manuals can have a similar "unnaturalizing" effect if constructing allies who recognize the privilege they hold, and the space they automatically inhabit in contemporary society. If manual analyses uncover assumptions of heteronormative, cisgender, even homonormative, occupation and doling out of space, revised "ally" construction can teach more privileged allies a role complimentary to queer and trans staking of space—ally relinquishing of space—as marginalized groups exert agency and take or make space for themselves as Flores and Lee describe.

Like Flores's Chicana, the queer individual finds themself constructed as an apology in popular discourse, "So sorry, does my sexuality make your religion squeamish?" "Do my gender identity and expression confuse you? We should just ignore them then."—but it is only in the acceptance of any role of "perpetrator" that queer communities give up space, legitimacy. The community must resist this resignation and safe spaces that exist only as an acquiescence from a hegemony. As Catherine Fox poses in "From Transaction to Transformation," "The normalized (good, pure, innocent) heterosexual ally is further reified through her or his prerogative to create

those spaces for 'others.' What if queers were to demand safe space?" (503). How Safe Space manuals bring allies to life—with what role and what privilege the manuals create and/or allow for allies—will define or redefine the ally/queer community relationship and construction of power, will construct the LGBTQIA+ community as timid and guilty, or as assertive and equally "pure." In relation to SSMs, the careful creation of both inter- and intragroup allies can limit appropriation of space from dominant group allies (or maintenance of hegemonic space), augment recognition of intersectionality through unapologetic, celebratory, diverse spaces, ensure creation of community member safe places, and recognize safe space as autonomously or cooperatively created, not simply an allowance from an empowered out-group. Such creation can amplify assertions of the space that must exist for the queer community. Manual examination for inter- and intragroup ally construction can illuminate if this necessarily explicit process has occurred. The examination might also reveal the result of a less focused "ally" construction: a continued hegemonic understanding of space.

An LGBT resource center's construction of, and address to, the ally then defines how the ally creates future safe spaces, enters safe spaces, and how they interact there. As allies generally come from more privileged positions than those they ally, this privilege may need recognition and regulation. Summarizing a discussion from Armond Towns's "Geographies of Pain," Joan Faber McAlister in "Ten Propositions" notes that converse to queer individuals asserting themselves, "a recent loss of control over space is being felt only by those who have been sheltered from the traumas of colonialism, imperialism, and racism" (115-6). If we can group allies, even intragroup allies with privilege (e.g. the homonormative "gay") into these protected subjectivities (and we often can), then SSM language constructing "ally" can announce limiting of privilege, and queer ownership of space—rather than catering to a sense of "loss of control

over space" potentially felt by non- or less-marginalized group members. For instance, Fox interprets her own experiences on a university campus, "It seemed to me that Safe Space stickers, while efforts to respond to a hostile climate for LGBT folks, actually served to create a safe space for folks to feel free from the guilt of homophobia and heterosexism" (503). Certainly this convolutes the intent of the SSM. Rather than providing allies with an alleviation of their own guilt, how else might SSMs construct ally priorities? How else might the manual ensure allies read a clear focus on the true intent, beneficiaries, and responsibilities of allied and safe spaces—not their own, however subconscious, interests?

If Safe Space training and its decals remain rhetorical tools for the queer community, how can resource centers promote allies emerging from these trainings recognizing complexities of power and privilege, and how those elements contribute to mapping of spaces? Who sets the parameters of ally and space then? While still recognizing the value of allies, any safety and space created through a center's manuals can belong first and foremost to the queer individual. We will examine how our resource center manual's construction of "ally" envisions space. Does the text allow no apology, concession, or compromise as to whom safe space belongs? In an effort to facilitate such considerations of privilege or space in the ally mind through manual language, let's turn our thoughts to some of the makeup of the ally, allyship, and privilege.

Allyship and Privilege

As illustrated by our contemplation of identity, alterity, and space so far, allyship is more complicated than a feeling of benevolence. Therefore, it is likely insufficient for Safe Space manuals to accept this one potential motivator as a sole basis for induction into allyship. Below we note that allyship may spring out of various self-referential life experiences and motivations, be influenced by an individual's identity and privilege, and be expressed on an individual basis

due to those factors. We now explore how manual understandings of "ally" could then, for a start, complicate a basic understanding of "ally" surrounding these elements for readers.

In an exploration of the complex constitution of allies, building on Thompson's 2005 concept of "ontological choreography," with "Making up Allies" Grzanka et al. look at (straight) ally identity as "identity choreography": a movement through one's past and experiences to build a current concept of self, a "way to describe...their straight ally identities and to evaluate others' ally identities and activisms" (4). The team describe that their interviewees thought "being an ally is less a pre-scripted role to be taken on and more of a nascent identity formation crosscut by generation/age, religion, and social class, among other intersecting dimensions of difference (Cole 2009; Goffman 1959; Shields 2008)" (15). These participants allowed for their own intersections, and used their individual hermeneutics to conceptualize "ally." Grzanka et al. continue, demonstrating that the participants seemed aware of heterosexism as a threatening force in the world, but also seemed to have only translated that threat in relation to their own experiences as dominant group members (Do I have to reject my homophobic religion? Will I myself be assumed to be gay or trans for my involvement in a queer cause?), rather than applying heterosexism's consequences to the queer community they would ally (179). We ask then, where do queer concerns come under consideration? Does SSM construction of the ally undercut purely self-referential reflection of intergroup allies and place queer concerns at the fore?

"Making up Allies" points to identities and concepts of "ally" that have come from a drawing upon—a dance among—an individual's own experiences, experiences that may not have anything to do with LGBTQIA+ individuals and causes. Ally construction can ground intergroup members' concept of "ally" outside of the trainee's own experience, and in relation to the queer community's needs. Grzanka et al. relate their results in a theorization of "'straight

ally' as a broad and mutable collective identity" (181). Such a construction benefits the straight ally and places little limit on what they do to be an "ally," or who their actions pertain to or affect. If intergroup individuals hold preconceived notions of "ally" created outside of queer community input, is the SSM prepared to integrate or challenge those notions of "ally" in non-queer minds? Does it limit "ally," and culture responsibility surrounding its performance?

An SSM can benefit from such deconstruction of self-reference in an ally, as demonstrated by Adam Fingerhut, and Grzanka et al. Fingerhut's "Straight Allies" points to research (Reason et al.; Worthington, Savoy, Dillon, and Vernaglia) demonstrating that further exploration of one's own privilege led to allies who were "more active as racial justice allies," and that clearer understanding of one's own heterosexuality, led "to a deeper understanding of LGB others and to LGB affirmative evaluations and behaviors" (2244). So while a resource center can't control participant experiences or positionings before encountering an SSM, we explore how resource centers address sexuality, gender, identity and privilege with participants through language surrounding these topics, as well as reflection on, discussion of, and ownership of privilege among both inter- and intragroup allies.

Grzanka et al.'s interviews suggest similar benefit to exploring privilege as Fingerhut's work: "Privilege—the unearned and unfair advantages of being a dominant social group member—was not, for example, a theme in our interviews, despite the focus on social inequality that framed all of our conversations." For all their choreography, the interviewees seem to have deftly danced around their own advantaged position in their identity constructions and concepts of "ally." Grzanka et al. continue that "foregrounding straight privilege—in addition to knowledge about LGBT people and issues...might redirect attention away from neoliberal discourse on identity politics and choice-making and toward the structural dynamics that

engender and constrict those choices" (17-8). If resource center materials exhibit, and then wish to move away from traits illuminated by Self, introspection and broader discussion may be necessary to refocus the ally and to deconstruct current concepts of "queer" mired in hetero- and homonormative values. We will examine how far the SSM pushes participants in allyship—are trainees allowed to simply take on the mantle of ally, or challenged to don it only after critical self-reflection in light of "structural dynamics"?

The participants from "Making up Allies" demonstrate how positioning outside of a subjectivity can allow for distorted perspective when construing without input from within that subjectivity. Privilege and the status quo reflect a hegemony which eliminates the compounding of challenges for some heterosexual allies and for certain members of the queer community itself (e.g. the homonormative gay). Such societal structuring creates a need for intragroup and intergroup allies in the queer community to fully address intersectional effects of oppressive structuring, and LGBT resource centers are in a position to encourage community input, examination of participant privilege, and an understanding of ally responsibility through SSM language and design.

While allies can add to a community in ways that the community itself might be unable to, by acting as saviors to a community, allies might also strain intergroup relationships and perpetuate the status quo. Thus, ally training manuals are challenged to adroitly, simultaneously, encourage and limit the concept of "ally." In constructing an identity of "ally" SSMs can recognize and offer counsel in the challenging role that allies take on, without offering carte blanche in addressing a community outside one's own. Without manuals acknowledging ally and allied subjectivities, any ally might complete a reading of an SSM with a blind spot regarding their allyship—a blind spot at best, an elevated and false sense of efficacy at worst. In creating

allies, we examine if our SSM trains for allyship that recognizes, investigates, and disallows privilege's power. Part of such an investigation might be a probe into the screens and framing allies in training unwittingly use.

Invention, Framing and Keying, and Screens

Our discussion thus far illustrates some of the considerations we will examine when analyzing the SSM and its concepts surrounding "ally": identity, alterity, space, and allyship and privilege. As the last topic exploring the background of our problem, we turn to a few rhetorical elements that might inadvertently play into the development of an SSM and its "ally" concept. But as directors might also intentionally utilize these devices to construct "ally," our examination of the manual will include a search for any notable uses of their employment.

Early work of center directors can "invent" and direct safe space manual messaging to ensure readers develop the same, or a similar, understanding of their experience with the manual.[1] Using theory from the five canons of rhetoric (of which Invention is one) and Erving Goffman, we can understand the work of SSMs as an invention of concepts for attendees, a revelation of previous frameworks of understanding, and a creation and keying of frameworks concerning allyship that a center may wish to instill. If creating "Safe Spaces" and allies to populate them are goals of a center's training manual, then the concept of "ally" and the directives for an ally can be intentional and cohesive "inventions" of LGBT resource centers.

Thomas Farrell's work speaks to the importance of the intentionality of these inventive acts, "Rhetorically, public memory is a resource for what is called social knowledge...In other words, social knowledge represents what we might call 'common sense.' Social knowledge tells

[1] In this current discussion, we often use "invention" in relation to Burke and Goffman, as it is the term used by the theorists themselves. Outside of "Invention, Framing and Keying, and Screens," we most often use the more contemporary "construction" instead of "invention." They should be understood similarly for this study.

us what is better and worse, what the acknowledged facts of the world are, and thereby represents something of a cultural 'second nature'" (147). Queer activism and rights currently fall outside these criteria (i.e. queers lives and rights are not yet common sensical, are "worse" than the "better," "normal" heteronormative life, and are often evaluated as choices or fantasies rather than "facts of the world"). Thus, in inventing queer social knowledge and taking up space in public memory, SSMs find arduous work. But by influencing public memory through trainings and allies, center directors have an opportunity to limit, and eventually eradicate, the othering of queer and trans individuals that keeps them and their causes removed from common public memory. As such, any unintentional, ambiguous understandings of allyship fail to capitalize on an opportunity to guide understanding and augment queer space in society. Thus, Side by Side evaluates the SSM for rhetorically sophisticated invention, and an aversion to ambiguity.

Goffman's concept of primary frameworks (assumptions) is generally applicable to recognizing previous understanding and creating new invention, and it is especially important in relation to our discussion of privilege and allyship. We are often blind to primary frameworks because the dominant social structure we function in imbues them with self-perpetuating power: "observers actively project their frames of reference into the world immediately around them, and one fails to see their so doing only because events ordinarily confirm these projections, causing the assumptions to disappear into the smooth flow of activity" (29). For instance, as relevant to our discussion, the queer community might be understood as worthy of pity and in need of help, and the intergroup ally conceived of as the provider of that pity and help—each of these being a societal assumption. Goffman recognizes analyzing frameworks in interrupting this "smooth flow" of assumption, as does Gilly Hartal in "Fragile Subjectivities." Hartal notes that

"Using frame theory is productive in that it clarifies diverse meanings of queer safe space and its understandings for different subject identities" (1055); Hartal achieves a more developed understanding of "queer safe space" by analyzing how we have framed the concept, and discovering that it has been framed monolithically.

Fox's "From Transaction to Transformation" also questions the framing of ally work. Clarifying the implications of limiting ally responsibility (as from one single group, such as non-queer individuals, or toward one single group, such as homonormative queer individuals), and limiting who belongs under "LGBTQIA+," Fox explains, "suggesting that other 'isms' [e.g. racism, ableism] are the work of other groups implies a universal gay experience in relation to homophobia and heterosexism. Such a move fails to recognize how heterosexism and homophobia are always inflected with race and gender and fails to recognize that queers who are marked 'other' by race and gender experience such oppressions differently" (498). This delineation underscores not only the need to recognize each individual as they fit uniquely into "LGBTQIA+," but the important work of intragroup championing within the queer community and its safe spaces. With such considerations, we start to recognize that the current frameworks of queer community and queer community allyship we use are insufficient.

Similarly, we look at another aspect of Self's "Queering Center," at her suggestion that "To interrupt and resist white homonormativity, heterosexism, and monosexism practitioners must conceptualize these forces within multiply and mutually reinforcing systems of oppression because how practitioners think about resistance effects how they enact it" (7-8). Self's discussion focuses initial responsibility on center directors that will construct concepts with the language of their manuals, and suggests manual language cannot be regarded as neutral, chosen without intention, or allowed to maintain hetero- and homonormative understandings of the

queer community and its allies—that it is well worth considering the position and positionality afforded all allies in manual conceptualizations vis-à-vis safe spaces.

As Goffman's, Hartal's, Fox's, and Self's work all demonstrate the importance of the frameworks we (most often unknowingly) use, we examine if the subject university's SSM uses such theory to seek out, evaluate, and disrupt—as necessary—pervasive frameworks of allyship and Safe Space." If Self's findings on hetero- and homonormative material development apply to the manual, do insufficient framings of the concepts, or lack of investigation of their frameworks contribute? As readers are unlikely to be as successful in recognizing primary frameworks alone, does the manual help construct an ally ready to uncover frameworks and bridge a developmental moment to new understandings?

In invention, Goffman's concept of keying is another element. Goffman discusses how keying a "definition of the situation can utterly suppress the ordinary meanings of the world" (40-3), those definitions that become invisible among our assumptions. Ally action in a manual reader's primary framework may take on different meaning if keyed in light of critical theory, for instance—just as the transposition of a familiar piece of music into a new key will affect a listener's understanding of the composition, as Goffman intends "a rough musical analogy" (44). As an example, Fox illustrates throughout "From Transaction to Transformation" how posting of a Safe Space decal after a training may be understood by a Safe Space participant as support for the LGBTQIA+ community, but can also be keyed as perpetuation of a hegemony. If, as Fox suggests, the space is actually "safe" in that it relieves non-marginalized ally guilt, then it may be necessary to "suppress the ordinary meanings of the world"—that safe space is for the queer individual—to key a new understanding of what the Safe Space decal may mean, maybe safety for heteronormative individuals. Thus keying might at times be seen as problematizing—"a

keying, then, when there is one, performs a crucial role in determining what it is we really think is going on" (Goffman 45). Since frames and keys are so ingrained, personal, and invisible, examination of SSMs for frameworks and keys may illustrate current manual interpretations, inconsistencies, or unintended lessons for attendees—as well as opportunities for complicating new concepts of allyship among trainees.

Finally, Burke provides another theory to support our conceptualizations of manual language and invention with his notion of "terministic screens." At this point in our discussion we have been keyed to the use of "queer" as a reclaimed and positive term—but as a terministic screen, consider also how another choice (e.g. "gay") would affect the tone and interpretation of this paper by limiting perception of who the community is, values, and includes. With the use of "gay" over "queer," we could easily consider trans folk as excluded from the conversation, and wonder about the inclusion of a great number of individuals of various positionings within the queer community. Burke postulates that in working to *reflect* a reality, we *select* realities (and their corresponding terms), which reflect a target reality for the audience, but also *deflect* interpretations we do not wish to bring to mind. Burke would note that selecting "queer" rather than "gay" is a "terministic screen" (*Language as Symbolic Action* 45), serving to reflect, select, and deflect concepts surrounding a topic. Certainly we hope to deflect marginalizing, disempowering, and hurtful readings of this paper by the choice of the reclaimed and inclusive term "queer," for instance. Similar choices of terms used in relation to allies, queer community, and allyship in the SSM will "screen" a participant's vision and produce a particular interpretation of concepts and relationships. Recall Hampton's "Turkish Dogs" from our discussion of alterity: how we name one another affects how we see and treat one another.

While terministic screening (indeed, invention or frame as well) may seem duplicitous—and could be used in such a manner—Burke points out we are unable to avoid terministic screens, "We *must* use terministic screens, since we can't say anything without the use of terms...any such screen necessarily directs the attention to one field rather than another" (*Language as Symbolic Action* 50). As we must communicate our ideas to one another through our language of symbols, we must hope to use our terminology with an awareness of terministic screening, focused intent, and integrity; we examine with this study what constructions the SSM achieves through application or mis-application of the three.

In closing our review of concepts then, we hope that it is clear that the rhetorical task of meaning-making, of construction, is paramount in the writing of Safe Space manuals, as safe space allyship and safety will depend on these understandings. In review, for instance: is any safe space autonomously created or perceived as "given" or "allowed"? Are allies solely intergroup associates or conceived of as intragroup allies as well? And is ally privilege (both intra- and intergroup) recognized and regulated? If Safe Space programs and their insignia will proliferate, how do LGBT resource centers create a framework of reference for ally roles, for who allies are and ally, and for the responsibility surrounding the work allies are expected to carry out? Side by Side hopes to facilitate exploration of how SSM constructions of "ally" provide discussion of, and responses to, questions such as these.

We turn now to the methodology of Side by Side, followed by analyses of the LGBT Resource Center's manual, and its directors' intentions for the manual.

Chapter IV: Research Methods

Side by Side examined the text of one university LGBT Resource Center's Safe Space manuals (three recent editions) and gathered interview data from former and current Center directors to explore answers to the following research questions.

Research Questions

To explore how the concept of "ally" is constructed, reinforced, or restructured in a manual reader's mind, we ask:

1. How do university LGBT resource centers rhetorically construct concepts of "ally" in their audience through ally training manual language?

2. What rationale informs university LGBT resource center language and design of ally training manuals' construction of "allyship"?

3. What recommendations supported by rhetorical concepts can strengthen university LGBT resource centers' ally training manuals, and therefore, trainings?

As per the scope of this study, we look at what the manual accomplishes alone. This is a research construct to enhance study focus, and as such isn't an accurate representation of a "manual/training facilitation" pairing. However, we will see that while manual and facilitation come together during the course of an actual training, that the LGBT Resource Center directors have also described—unprompted and without reference to the study's scope—uses of the manual that might occur away from a training.

In addition, concerning manual "Invitation," we discuss how directors value meeting training participants where they are, which might translate into participants reflecting later—perhaps much later—on. So, a participant obligated to attend a training (as discussed by Director

O) may be distracted or uninvested during the training itself, and may have their most meaningful "Safe Space" experience at another time, alone with the manual.

We might also consider cases apart from the training where the manual is shared with a member of the queer community who has come to the ally, where the manual has been loaned out to a curious friend, or where the ally shares the manual in whole or in part in their own presentation or advocacy. In short, a manual/training pairing cannot be guaranteed in all cases. As such, Side by Side offers value in a discussion of the manual alone's construction of "ally" and "allyship," outside of the value of focus in regard to the study's scope.

Participants

The participants for the Director Interview were four recent directors of the LGBT Resource Center at the university. Each was involved with the writing or updating of the manual during their tenure as director. The directors interviewed for Side by Side led the Center from 1999 to the present, with the exception of the years 2003-2007. All dates were self-reported by the directors, and the investigator had conflicting reports as to who led the Center during the 2003-2007 gap.

The directors of the LGBT Resource Center contributed to the evolution of the SSMs in various, but related manners. Even Director A (the earliest director consulted for the study) felt unsure she had written anything for the manuals per se, although the other directors credit her as an originator of the manual. The directors discussed pulling from sources on best practices or queer theory, and in some cases, writing for the manual. They also discussed adding and revising language, like Director A's language of the Gender Unicorn, Director O's more extensive inclusion of identities, or Director I's ensuring that manual language coincided better with current conversations surrounding allyship and identity. Director I's influence is most notable in

our three editions, as his tenure oversaw the reworking of the manual that produced our edition three. In this third edition pages have been rearranged to match the flow of an actual training, language has been evaluated as noted above, and the manual also underwent a visual redesign under Director I.

Materials

The rhetoric of allyship in relation to the LGBT Resource Center and its Safe Space training manual was explored through two data sets:

1. Through exploration of the current, and two former, LGBT Resource Center Safe Space ally training texts which propagate and bring to life the intent, language, framework, and identities imagined by the Center's directors.
2. Through interviews with the current, and three former, directors of the LGBT Resource Center—all of who have been involved with the design and evolution of the Center's Safe Space manuals. Therefore, each has been directly involved with the Center's construction of ally identities, and voiced the intent behind those constructions.

Research Methods: The Manual

While we are not looking ethnographically at a people per se, Safe Space training does create a culture among its participants and materials. Dale Sullivan points to value and culture within educational processes in a discussion of education as epideictic rhetoric, "When the student has become completely habituated in appropriate forms of reasoning *(logos)* and in just sentiments *(pathos)*, he or she may be said to have taken on or internalized the *ethos* of the culture" (71). Viewing Safe Space training as such an educational process and cultural inculcation of honoring individuals in their sexual orientations and gender identities, we then through ideological analysis, followed a similar process to that used by Gerry Philipsen in

"Talking Like a Man in 'Teamsterville'" and its antecedents (13): noting repetitive elements in a culture to decipher its unspoken values (often linguistic elements in this study). This examination of language also encourages the frame analysis proposed by Hartal and Goffman. Through exploration of one of culture's prominent features—language—used in the three manuals, categorizations of "culture construction" and "talk" (Philipsen 14) positioning the ally and revealing power structures will be discussed as topics relevant to the queer community and SSM.

Here we have a hermeneutic objective: rhetorical analysis and critique of the SSM.

Example of term exploration from this analysis: pronouns of address. When the audience is the intergroup ally, what relationship is established with the allied through use of "you" or "we" constructions, for instance?

Example of exploration of directive language and rhetorical intent: language used to approach the audience. While we discuss "construction" often in this study, Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin offer an alternative "invitational rhetoric" based on feminist ideals of "equality, immanent value, and self-determination" (4), noting that traditional rhetorical concepts of "persuasion," "intent," and "construction" contain "patriarchal bias" (2). Does the SSM generally employ an "invitational" or "persuasive" address of the audience, and what agency does such address encourage for the reader of the SSM?

Research Methods: The Director Interview

Interviews with LGBT Resource Center directors were conducted via Zoom and recorded for analysis. The interviews followed the format of the LGBT Resource Center Director Interview (Appendix A), with allowance for organic development of discussion points. LGBT Resource Center recent former directors, and the present director, were interviewed to clarify, affirm and/or refute perceived intent of their Safe Space manual/s, center, and communities. Modelled

from Kenneth Burke's "dramatistic pentad" (German 93), the director interview was based on an approach of pentadic criticism to explore the who, what, when, where, and why of the manual and agency as imagined by Center directors. During interviews with the directors, the directors were asked questions from seven categories. These categories consist of:

1. Director background

   Example question: What was the popular attitude toward the LGBTQIA+ community at the time of your tenure as director?

2. Language constructing, or in discussion of, the ally or ally community

   Example question: How do you intend the construction of the SSM to guide a participant's concept of "ally"?

3. Audience for the Safe Space manual

   Example question: If I were to say I feel the SSMs have heteronormative/cisgender/non-queer individuals as the audience, how would you respond?

4. The queer individual as intragroup ally

   Example question: Are SSMs designed to catalyze a change in queer individuals' perceptions of the LGBTQIA+ community?

5. Language constructing queer community, ally and manual relationships

   Example question: Do you feel the manual ever positions the ally as empowered and offering salvation to the queer community?

6. Language addressing privilege and responsibility

   Example question: The manuals open with an invitation to "Participate to your own comfort level." Please discuss any intent, or implications, for an ally you see in this invitation.

7. Intent for the Safe Space training manual and its construction

   Example question: What was your main goal for the Safe Space training manual?

For a complete list of director interview questions, see Appendix A.

Upon completion of the text analysis and exploration of director intent through interviews, our objective became hortatory, and we consulted rhetorical theory to consider the clarity, efficacy and focus of Safe Space manual language.

Chapter V: Findings

Manual Analysis

Upon analysis of the Safe Space manuals, Side by Side found five categories of manual rhetorical function—the functions that together synthesize "ally"—each serving our larger "constructing" of the ally: positioning, inviting, informing, instructing, and charging. In manual construction of "ally" for the reader, the manual *positions* an audience as well as queer, non-queer, and ally individuals in relation to one another and power, the manual *invites* the reader into training, allyship, and participation, it *informs* the reader of important queer community and queer community allyship issues, *instructs* the reader on how specifically to be a queer community ally, and *charges* the reader with certain responsibility as an ally. The manual proposes four similar levels of "Becoming an Ally" consisting of "Awareness," "Knowledge/Education," "Skills," and "Action" (17).[2] While we see no equivalent for Side by Side's "Positioning" or "Inviting" function in these levels, there is certainly a rough equivalency of "Awareness" and "Knowledge/Education" to our own "Informing," of "Skills" to our "Instructing," and of "Action" to our "Charging." One might bear in mind the similarity between the manual's own levels of "becoming an ally" to the rhetorical functions Side by Side uncovered in the manual's "ally" construction. In our Manual Analysis we look at rhetorical functionings and readings of a construction through positioning, invitation, informing,

[2] When referencing the Safe Space manuals, pagination from the third edition of the three manuals examined for this study (the most current manual) will be used. Text and information from the previous two manuals will either be identical to the text and information from the third edition, or the discrepancies will not affect the trait under consideration. Pagination from the earlier editions will not necessarily correspond. When a page number refers only to an inclusion or feature of editions one and two (which are essentially identical text-wise), the page number will be marked with an asterisk, e.g. (8*).

instruction, and charging followed by further discussion and potential applications to future manuals in the following sections: Discussion, and Recommendations.

Manual Analysis: Construction

In an effort to construct a coherent concept for another, the rhetor must first have a clear understanding of the target conceptualization themself, center directors must have their own understanding of "ally." In a discussion of language planning and framework, Robert Cooper suggests one examine "what *actors* attempted to influence what *behaviors*, of which *people*, for what *ends*, by what *means*, and with what *results*" as "a set of rubrics such as these helps us to select and organize our observations" (46-7). In our evaluation of the manual's construction of the ally, we will examine the manual in light of Cooper's suggestion, and in light of our concepts of consubstantiality, participation, framing, and terministic screens to evaluate how a director's understanding of "ally" and its subsequent presentation might affect and construct an ally.

The manual never refers to itself as an entity or to its mission, but it does list "The overall mission" of the Safe Space program:

1. "Raise awareness of queer issues"

2. "Pledge a commitment to fostering an environment that is devoid of discrimination based on one's sexual orientation, sexual identity, or gender identity" (2).

As we move through the subsequent sections of Positioning, Inviting, Informing, Instructing, and Charging, we will explore how manual construction aids or impedes these manual training goals. Our exploration of these constructions will include parts of speech, inclusion and exclusion of key concepts, and the conversation provided around those concepts.

Manual Analysis: Positioning

As we move into the manual rhetorical functions, let's consider for whom the manual is constructing: positioning, inviting, informing, instructing, and charging. Allies are asked to join the queer community in advancement of its social and political concerns, but who do the manuals understand that invitation to address? In current editions of the manual, we will examine a presentation of intergroup allies as the primary manual audience, a separate and empowered positioning of intergroup allies in relation to the queer community, a lack of recognition of intragroup allies and intersectionality, and the instructions for allyship given to the (understood as non-queer) audience. Reading the manual as a queer individual, the investigator cannot help but recognize a secondary audience that seems largely unaddressed by the manual: the queer audience. As we look at the positioning that the manual accomplishes, let's consider not only who the manual positions as its audience, but also how its constructive choices position queer individuals, non-queer individuals, and allies in relation to one another.

Manual Analysis: Positioning through Pronouns

Those familiar with discussions of queer and trans concerns will have heard and/or engaged in conversations concerning pronouns that accurately represent one's gender identity; readers of the manual will find such discussion in "Gender Pronouns" (10). In "Positioning through Pronouns" we won't look at the ability of pronouns to accurately represent an individual in reference to that same individual, but rather the ability of pronouns to address, engage, and task an audience.

We begin our look at positioning through pronouns with "one." "One" is useful in the neutral process of informing the reader as it ascribes no traits to the reader, or to the sentence subjects under discussion in relation to the topic. We could say it offers no terministic screening: "one" can be agender,

female, transgender, a queer person of color, and so on—the pronoun offers no information on identity at all. We can look to edition three's "Coming into One's Identity (aka Coming Out): A Basic Understanding" (12) for an example. As well as being featured in the section title, we see several uses of "one" throughout the discussion, such as: "The process of coming into one's identity looks different for each person" (12). In this example we see how "one" leaves the individual open to interpretation. The individual coming into their identity could relate to any number of identities under the queer umbrella (the intent of the particular manual discussion), but "one" goes even further. With the use of "one" this statement could also be a blanket statement that includes a privileged or a marginalized individual outside of the queer community coming to grips with the ramifications of their positioning. So while the focus of the discussion is clearly a queer individual's experience of coming out, we see that "one" does not draw boundaries, and allows for connection by any member of an audience. Similarly, during "Sexual Orientation vs. Gender Identity vs. Biological Sex" (3), the pronoun is used out of necessity, as the manual simultaneously discusses all possible positionings in relation to sexual orientation, gender identity, and biological sex. Any suggestion of gender through nouns or pronouns is therefore precluded. Thus, the use of "one" does little to pointedly address, engage, or task an audience, but it also does nothing to limit or alienate potential reader audiences and identities.

The use of "I"/"me"/"my" is uncommon in the manual, as we might expect from a text generally intended for group consumption. Narrator references to the self will not engage an audience in the same manner as more inclusive "we," or more direct "you," constructions will. We have one instance of "I"/"me"/"my" in the manual which will be further addressed in an analysis of the manual's "Treatment of Privilege" below, as it positions the reader as a recipient of cisgender privilege (7). Although this discussion limits in assuming a cisgender reader, the use of "I"/"me"/"my" works to help those cisgender readers begin to see their involvement with

privilege. A “we”/“us”/“our” construction might have a similar effect, but would also diffuse individual responsibility. “You”/“you”/“your” constructions would draw a connection, but sacrifice some of the personal “I”/“me”/“my” perspective, and might insinuate a higher level of accusation than the manual would intend.

We see a second use of “I”/“me”/“my” in our first two editions of the manual in “Responsibilities” (33*): “As a provider of a Safe Space at [subject university], I recognize my responsibilities to: Be an active listener to all who request my services as a Safe Space Provider; Continue to educate myself on Queer issues.” As the process of “ally” construction has been completed by the time we reach “Responsibilities” at the end of the manual, and as the reader has been positioned, invited, informed, and instructed, the reader is placed in a first-person view of what are now their own responsibilities—a final, personalized charge to apply the discussions of the manual. This personalization is lost in edition three, as “Responsibilities” is renamed “Safe Space Responsibilities” (29), and uses “one” rather than “I”/“me”/“my.”

Continuing our discussion of audience positioning through pronouns—how those choices might affect a reader’s concept of who an ally is, and if the reader themself can be a part of that ally group—we next look at “we”/“us”/“our.” This choice of address is at times inclusive and at times exclusive. We see inclusivity in “Sex, Gender & Bipolarity,” as the section states “In our society there are people who are intersex” (7), and “our society” is again used inclusively on page 12. Both discussions that feature these statements are what we will come to call “informative”—the tone and address are mostly neutral, and anyone of any identity can feel a part of the discussion. This is the most common effect of “we”/“us”/“our” in the manual.

There is, however, also at least one instance of “we”/“us”/“our” where its effect in combination with prepositions can be construed as othering for trans individuals. In “Supporting

Trans People" we read the phrase "...send the message out to trans people in our communities…" (9). We will discuss this further in our analysis of manual prepositions, but in such a construction, a trans manual audience may understand themselves positioned outside of "our communities," rather than as a part of them.

Finally, we see use of "you"/"you"/"your" pronouns in the manual. "You"/"you"/"your" is used as informative or instructive in the manual. Despite what we might expect from a pronoun referring directly to the reader, the manual at times uses "you"/"you"/"your" in a generic fashion, like we have seen "one" used, or in the plural sense of "you." An example phrase is "Below you will find how heteronormativity plays our [sic] in a straight sexual orientation" (19). We could substitute both "Below *one* will find..," or "Below *you folks* will find…" in this phrase. This construction does not actually particularly address the reader directly, it remains rather neutral and informative.

We do see "you"/"you"/"your" used to directly address the audience as well, however. In "What Do I Do if Someone Comes Out to Me?", "Becoming an Ally," and "How to Be an Ally" (16-8), the manual speaks directly to the reader as an ally about their role. "You must learn to take your awareness and knowledge and learn to communicate it to others" (17), "Do not wait for a queer individual to come out to your group to begin discussing these issues" (18)—the reader feels addressed with duty in this construction. This styling is useful as a call to action for many readers, and creates a sense of responsibility. As we will discuss further though, the "you" the manual addresses may need further definition.

Manual Analysis: Positioning Queer as Monolithic or Diverse

Since our discussion centers on the construction of "ally" in the manual, and to the audience of the manual, let's contemplate manual moves in positioning the queer community for

burgeoning allies. Do we find a homonormative, monolithic representation of the community? Or do we find a more intersectional representation allowing for more nuanced understandings of allyship? The answer, as is often the case with the manual, does not lie at one extreme or the other.

In the actual text of the manual, we find support for a recognition of a multiplicity of queer experiences. On the first page of the manual, the text offers us "About the Word 'Queer'" (1). Here we learn that "queer" will be used "as an umbrella term to represent the greater LGBT+ community." Side by Side has aimed for a similar keying to, and use of, the term. Without this key, the subsequent use of "queer" might lead readers of the manual from outside the community to position queer and trans individual into a singular queer experience. Consider one of the "Goals" listed on page 1, "Develop an awareness of issues faced by queer people." Those new to a discussion of matters relevant to the queer community might assume those concerns were the same across the board. But given sections delineating gender identity, gender expression, and gender perception (4) for example, or discussion focused around trans folk (8-9), questioning individuals (15), or queer and trans people of color (21), the intergroup ally begins to understand the breadth of queer experiences, as does the intragroup ally.

A particularly direct reminder of this variety of identity and lived experiences comes with the transition from the "Cass Identity Development Model" which discusses general stages of a coming out process regarding sexual orientation (13), to the "Arlene Istar Lev 'Transgender Emergence Model'" (14). As discussion of the "Transgender Emergence Model" begins, the manual reminds us, "Gender and sexual orientation are two separate spectrums of identity and each require a distinct model of identity development (14)." Here the manual says to us more explicitly what is has been illustrating through a choice of topics—queer and trans experiences

are diverse, and each story unique; the communities are positioned as distinct entities. This explicit assertion is worth noting as it is rare in the manual and one of the few, albeit brief, instances of the manual drawing attention directly to various positionings among queer experiences.

We've seen then that the manual does move the reader away from a monolithic understanding of queer experience, but we want to be careful not to imply that that movement means manual discussion thoroughly addresses intersectionality. Intersectionality is most developed as a topic in "Beyond Marriage: A Few Queer Issues" (20-2). This is the last section of the manual, occurring on pages 20-2 out of 30, before moving into resources and the glossary. Stylistically, the information in these pages isn't broken into more digestible units like stages or bullet points, as much of the information of the manuals is; the topic's subsections are the longest and densest paragraphs of the manual, and even the lengthier topics here feature no paragraphing. Not only does introduction to the specific topic of intersectionality occur relatively late in the manual, it is perhaps the least accessible information in the manual (although that is not to say it is wholly inaccessible). As with much of the manual, the treatment of the topic ends with our "informing" stage.

Manual Analysis: Diversity through Modal Verbs

Housed under our consideration of a diverse or monolithic positioning of queer individuals for readers of the manual, we examine the effect of modal verbs. One way that the manual supports a broader understanding of queer experiences outside of the variety of topics it presents, is a use of modal verbs. Modal verbs are verbs of possibility, of conditions. They indicate what one "might," "could," even "should," do or feel, but they do not indicate what one necessarily actually does or feels, or necessarily will do or will feel. As such, they open the door

to an understanding of a multiplicity of experiences within the queer and trans communities—they do not address the queer community as monolithic. In "Coming into One's Identity (aka Coming Out): A Basic Understanding" (12) for example, we see modal constructions. Rather than stating how a queer individual feels about coming out, what they fear in doing so, or what they want in doing so, the manual instead presents "How might queer people feel about coming out?", "What might queer people be afraid of?", and "Why might queer people want to come out to family and friends?" These questions are each followed by a variety of possible responses, indicating some possibilities for a coming out experience. These modal constructions and lists are further supported by an explicit statement that "The process of coming into one's identity looks different for each person."

Manual Analysis: Subject Positioning and Subversive Stances

As a final consideration for the positioning moves of the manual, we introduce discussion of subject positioning and subversive stances. Barry Brummett's theorization of a text's subject positioning(s) and subversive stances related to that subject positioning suggests, "to be a certain kind of subject is to take on a sort of role or character...the power that a text has over you has a lot to do with what kinds of subject positions it encourages (or forces) you to inhabit" (129)—for the purposes of our study one subject position is "ally," certainly, but does the text suggest any other subject positions? As we move into "Inviting," and especially "Instructing," we will propose a subject positioning of the audience as non-queer, and thus, the concept of "ally" in the manuals as intergroup. As complement to the subject position, subversive stances, "positions taken deliberately by the reader in opposition to the 'preferred' subject position suggested most strongly by the text" (Brummett 129), may be necessary in response to a non-queer subject positioning then. A gay reader, for instance, might find themself in a subversive stance, feeling

unrecognized as part of the manual audience, and rejecting or rebelling against the manual's message because of such a perception.

Gill and Whedbee's concept of the "implied audience" might also be illustrative here. They describe the implied audience: "Just as we distinguish between a real rhetor and rhetorical persona, we also can distinguish between a real audience and an 'implied audience'. The 'implied audience' (like the rhetorical persona) is fictive because it is created by the text and exists only inside the symbolic world of the text" (Van Dijk 167). Side by Side reads the SSM's implied audience as the heterosexual and cisgender audience, and while the text seems to create this audience, it is actually fictive, and exists only within the text. Outside the text, individuals both from within, and outside of, the queer community attend Safe Space trainings and read the Safe Space manual.

With our examination of some of the pronouns and verbs at play in the manual, as well as considerations for audience and queer community positioning, we have introduced questions concerning the inclusivity of address of the manual. Although, as topics of discussion, the manual represents the queer and trans communities fairly well as diverse. We've also introduced "subject positioning," "subversive stances," and "implied audiences" as they contribute to the positioning of the ally for readers, and to illustrate the effects the manual's positioning of a reader may have on that reader's involvement with the text. We will continue to explore how the manual engagement of its audience will have implications for reader interpretations of the manual, of "ally," and of manual audience. Toward that endeavor, let's turn to the second major rhetorical function, the second major meaning-maker, of the manual, "Invitation," to explore what audience the manual invites into allyship, and how that audience is invited.

Manual Analysis: Inviting

The manual operates rhetorically through invitation in two manners. The first is an invitation to engage, or not. This invitation comes on the first page of the manual: "Participate to your own comfort level" (1). From taking part in every activity and sharing your own story, to not engaging at all, the manual sets the reader up immediately to engage as they see fit. This invitation is quite prominent as the first message to the reader, and its intent is reflected through much of the construction of the manual.

A second invitation comes in the manual's "Informing," which we discuss as a manual function next. Aligned with the opening invitation to participate at one's own comfort level, and with Foss and Griffin's "presentation of information" (a consideration of one's immanent value, equality, and self-determination rather than an attempt to persuade them), informative passages in the manual invite a change in knowledge, but not necessarily in action. Likewise, as we will discuss in "Treatment of Privilege" and "Imperatives: Assertive and Receptive Verbs," the audience is invited to inform themselves about privilege without pointedly and critically turning reflection toward themself, or they are invited to act *upon* the queer community rather than *in response to,* or *in tandem* with it. That is to say, on some levels, the reader is invited to come as they are, remain as they are—on some levels, the heteronormative reader is invited to maintain power with a certain appeal to ego and the status quo.

On other levels, the reader is invited into responsibility. The issue we will return to, however, is the overall address of the manual to an intergroup ally who may need more than an invitation to "educate" themself, who may be in need of persuasion to critically reflect on their positioning and its contribution to the maintenance of the status quo—as our fifth rhetorical

function we will examine any such manual moves toward charging the reader. For now, we move to the third function, a more developed discussion of how the manual informs its audience.

Manual Analysis: Informing

In informing its readers, the manual maintains a neutral address of audience, as well as neutral treatment of the queer community. While at instructive points of the manual, for example (discussed below), the queer individual or community might seem positioned as an "other," during informative passages and sections such as "Sexual Orientation vs. Gender Identity vs. Biological Sex" (3), "Gender Pronouns" (10), or "Heterosexuality in a Post-Closeted Culture" (19), the queer individual and community remain under a clinical, removed gaze. The reader themself may or may not be a part of the queer community, may be an inter- or intragroup ally, and is offered potentially informative, and thought-provoking data equally in either case. For instance, "Sexual Orientation vs. Gender Identity vs. Biological Sex" serves essentially as a glossary for the three terms from the section title, and "Heterosexuality in a Post-Closeted Culture" informs without positioning the queer or heterosexual community with or apart from the narrator or reader in its discussion. In these instances of informative styling and others in the manuals, the ally is not positioned in any manner; they are not instructed in what to do or how to be—they are not mentioned. Rhetorically, this presentation positions the information as more important than the reader, or the reader's identity. The information simply exists for absorption or review by the reader.

As discussed here, our third manual function, informing, offers information vital to better understanding the queer and trans communities and concerns, as well as a broader array of experiences from within the communities. These informative passages remain largely devoid of

action and responsibility. As we move into our next rhetorical function, instructing, the manual takes on construction of the ally through the actions it offers allies.

Manual Analysis: Instructing

In instructing its readers, the manual seems to take on a particular, limited, address to a non-queer audience. This address limits the audience and ignores intersectional concerns, intragroup allyship, and queer community agency. Its word choices subtly reinforce a division between heteronormative and queer communities, and the power inherent in current heteronormative and cisgender positioning—an interpretation supported by the following features.

Manual Analysis: Instructing through Prepositions

Prepositions are extremely common in the English language as they are used to denote location and relation between objects and individuals. In the manual's construction we are not talking about a literal, physical positioning, but one of power dynamics. There is a tendency of the manual through its use of prepositions to position the queer community as receivers of aid, rather than autonomous in their own lives and spaces. This often occurs in descriptions of the roles, goals, or responsibilities of the ally or training. As one example, the manual describes one function of the Safe Space program as "to increase visibility and support for queer faculty, staff, students, and clients on campus and in the community" (2). While subtle, the use of "for" positions the reader apart from the groups of queer individuals mentioned, and implies a giving or contribution—positionings that hold some level of power. We will examine several more examples of prepositions and positioning in our "Discussion" section below.

Manual Analysis: Instructing through Imperatives - Assertive and Receptive Verbs

While instructing one how to act in a role, imperative verbs are the most direct method of communication, removing extraneous information and focusing attention on the action. As with prepositions, they may offer subtle interpretations of power. In offering assertive verbs to allies, the manual keys the reader into privilege they may or may not choose to share with a queer community member. While instructed to act in affirmation of the queer community, the implication is that the empowered ally might also act in an invalidating manner with little consequence to themself, and as such, holds the fate of the queer community in their hands (if I am instructed to *include* a group, the implication is that it is also within my prerogative to *exclude* them). Certainly the manual encourages support of the queer community and does have instances of receptive verbs for instruction (verbs where the ally acts on oneself, or in response to—but never on—another, e.g. "Listen actively to others" [1], "take responsibility for educating yourself" [16]). However, with common, assertive, empowering verbs for allies (e.g. "acknowledge" (9) or "validate" (15), examined further in "Discussion" below), an assumption of non-queer allyship, and mention of queer groups only as the subject of these actions, the manual limits audience apart from the queer community and empowers that audience in relation to the queer community. Assertive verbs for the ally, rather than receptive verbs that include queer community agency or participation, key the "ally" concept toward saviorship of the queer community.

Manual Analysis: Charging

We view charging as separate from the instructing previously examined in that instructing lays out what an ally *can* do and be, and that charging lays out what the manual *expects* an ally to do and be. The manual's charge presents expectations for making change to

your environment and yourself (which may or may not affect change in structures of privilege, but have effect locally), but fewer expectations for reflecting critically and recognizing yourself as a player in structures of privilege, which may better aid in dismantling them.

The manual offers examples of the former, from "Experiment with new ideas" (as a training "norm") (1), or "take responsibility for educating yourself" (16), to "When you become aware of homophobic/transphobic acts or discussions, confront them" (18), to "Seek assistance and guidance whenever necessary" (29). The manual lays out expectations for gaining knowledge, and for affecting change around one's self.

An incidence of an implied and more critical internal charge existed in editions one and two of the manual in a definition of "ally" in "Terms and Definitions," but is absent from edition three: "Ally: Someone who *confronts* heterosexism, homophobia, biphobia, transphobia, heterosexual and gender-straight privilege *in themselves* and others" (27*; emphasis added). Here we saw a challenge to the reader to not only become generally aware of the concept of privilege, but to recognize it critically as potentially central in the way they are able to live their life, and at what cost to others. As noted, this challenge is not present in the third, current, edition.

As we will discuss below, we do not see other address of deep introspection and reflection upon one's own privilege—or its contributions to a social structure that enables that privilege.

Manual Analysis: Treatment of Privilege

The closest we come to a reader engaging with privilege in the manual is "What is Cis-Gender Privilege?" (7). Here the reader encounters the effects of cisgender privilege from the first person perspective (I/me/my): "Strangers don't assume they can ask me what my genitals

look like and how I have sex;" "I do not have to worry about whether I will be able to find a safe and accessible bathroom or locker room to use." These "I" statements may resonate with cisgender readers and result in reflection, but the manual stops short of directly asking readers to engage in reflection on their relationship with privilege. The manual provides for a cisgender recognition of privilege, but the bulleted list of privileges in not followed by any other text, or discussion or reflection questions. Naturally, for readers who do not identify as cisgender, the "I" statements will hold less meaning, and speak again to understandings of a non-queer audience.

As a final consideration of the manual's charge, we see another implicit lesson on privilege in "Safe Space Responsibilities" (29), as readers are asked to "Actively confront homophobia, transphobia, and other types of discrimination in one's work environment, life, and one's community." Focus on action importantly includes external work, but fails to develop an address of equally important internal confrontations of discrimination and privilege that might exist. "Life" here could be intended as "one's own interactions and internal workings," or "one's self"—which could affect internal reflection—but might also be read less engagingly as "in one's comings and goings," as it is ambiguously worded.

Now, as we leave our analysis of the manual itself, and in partial response to our first research question: *How do university LGBT resource centers rhetorically construct concepts of "ally" in their audience through ally training manual language?*, we summarize: in this university Safe Space training manual's construction of "ally", as demonstrated through its positioning of audience, application of parts of speech such as pronouns or imperatives, and focus on "informing" a potential ally, we seem to have the construction of an intergroup ally. To further explore the Safe Space manual's construction of "ally," and the validity of this initial interpretation, we move now to an analysis of Side by Side's Director Interview.

Director Interview Analysis

In opening our analysis of data from our LGBT Resource Center directors, we will look at director goals for the manual, some general perceptions concerning attitudes toward the LGBTQIA+ community during the directors' tenures, and the directors' feelings about allies and interactions between the queer community and its intergroup allies. We will then move into director discussions more focused on manual positioning, and manual invitation. As some director thoughts will continue to be tied into the context of particular discussions within this paper, this opening will address the director interviews more generally.

Topics will follow the same progression as in the previous "Manual Analysis," although not every topic or subtopic will have been covered in the director interviews, and many will not receive treatment here. For purposes of reader orientation and formatting consistency, subtopics included will be listed under their parent topic (i.e. Positioning, Inviting, Informing, or Instructing) throughout our current section, Section Five: Findings.

To help frame our own reference of director intent and understanding, we will look at director objectives, the zeitgeist of their tenures, their feelings surrounding "ally," and their views on queer and non-queer community interactions. Let's begin by looking at director objectives for allies and the manual. Among the roles and intentions the directors had for allies, we find: listening, receiving education; engaging in conversations and engaging/reflecting with oneself continually; learning terms, beginning an awareness of queer identities, building empathy and breaking down stereotypes; examining your experiences and recognizing how little you know; displaying the Safe Space sticker, creating safe space, serving as a resource, and supporting LGBT students interconnectedly as an ally; and imagining allyship in action,

actualizing visualizations, and creating authentic allyship. This list is a compilation of responses from the four directors, but we see themes of active allyship, reflection, dialogue, and learning across the responses—engagement that will extend beyond a training or manual reading; as posited by Director A, "The end of the training wasn't the end, it was the beginning...ally is a verb, right?"

We see many similar outcomes listed in what the directors saw as the "main goal" for their Safe Space manual: create inclusive environments, spaces and experiences, and educate other folks on how to do that; expose trainees to language, break stereotypes, foster an understanding of identities and of the queer community, and increase empathy; be a learning tool for participants of a training, and provide tangible strategies for one to engage actively as an ally; be a tangible tool for reflection and a reference guide after the training; and move us from a collective ignorance toward a more informed population.

Overall, the director participants described their welcome at the Center, their students, and the campus as "warm" (Director A), "overall supportive" (Director Q), and "affirming" (Director I). However, Director Q mentioned microaggressions, covert heterosexism and homophobic behaviors, and Director I noted that both students and faculty were generally positive, but not as verbose in support as he would like. Director O recalled the discussion and vote around marriage equality during his tenure that:

> forced many conversations for our heterosexual counterparts...there were folks who were very staunch supporters of the queer community, and there were a lot of people who were, I think—maybe for the very first time ever—engaging deeply in their thoughts and their feelings and their attitudes about the queer community—

> there was robust conversation happening around queer identity and queer issues, and specifically around marriage equality.

Asked about a counterpart to the "staunch support," he responded, "Absolutely...it was very controversial at that time," noting particularly that some religious communities and private businesses were resistant. The directors felt that the city, and community at large housing the subject university were not as open or progressive as the campus community itself. While the campus community itself was more welcoming, it was not without homophobic issues or some timidity of support at times.

Asked to reflect on their thoughts on the word and concept "ally" during their tenure, the directors often had positive feelings about the term. Directors A, O, and Q described their feelings as "positive," "very positive," and "critical, invaluable" respectively—although each noted that the term in society and their understanding of it has evolved since their work with the Center. Director I, the most recent of the directors, had a response more reflective of new thinking concerning the term:

> I'll be honest, I don't like the word "ally." I think that it's pleasing to the ear of those that hold power, as well as those that are trying to do better because they recognize the atrocities, the oppression that's around them and that they are complicit in doing. I like the term "advocate" because I believe that it really centers actions in its operation. Ideally, I would like to not have "ally" in the manual whatsoever, and shift it over to "advocate" which requires people to do more work, to do better work, and I think to be more engaging in one's own community but also communities that are unlike theirs.

Directors A and Q found a symbiotic relation between the queer community at their centers and the intergroup allies that worked alongside them. Director A described the Center and its space as a "supportive community," and Director Q emphasized the contribution of allies in her center: "Critical. Allies were highly engaged, interwoven into the fabric of what we did, both in our programming, in our outreach. Allies played a very important role. I do not recall any tensions [between queer and non-queer individuals]." Director O and Director I related a different relationship between non-queer and queer center patrons though. Director O recalled a "push/pull" between the queer community and its allies, and Director I described tensions between the two groups in today's climate:

> It's tense. A lot of queer and trans students, while they appreciate the support of allies, they see the Center itself as being a space for queer and trans people...there is a misunderstanding by queer individuals of who actually is at fault for creating homophobia, transphobia or enacting that out—in that it's systemic, and then that plays out through the individual. It's a little tense right now. It's not volatile, and it's not harmful, but there are some barriers placed by queer individuals and the queer community for safety and security, and I would go to even sometimes pettiness too [laughs]. I see allies wanting to be supportive but timid, because they feel that sense of discomfort from the queer community. But I also think that allies are receiving a lot of messaging right now of "It's not your time to speak, it's not your time to be the spearhead for a lot of initiatives or opportunities, and instead, prop up those who carry marginalized identities."

Considering that Directors A and Q led the Center earlier than did Directors I and O, and looking at the previous responses toward "ally" and ally/queer community member relationships,

we see a complicating of the discussions and relationships surrounding, and between, the queer community and its allies. Current Director I's comments in comparison to many sentiments of the earlier directors is vivid illustration of this change. As we work through director discussions of audience in the manual, we will recall this complication.

Director Interview Analysis: Positioning

A more limited understanding of manual audience (i.e. the intergroup ally) is generally supported by the audience expectations of the directors. Director Q noted the training was required for administrators during her tenure, although open to faculty, staff, and students—"Everyone!" Somewhat opposed to this particular comment though, during our discussion she seemed to most specifically and intentionally conceive of a "straight," "heteronormative" ally and audience, as we will see in future comments. Directors O and I view training audiences as 90% and 80% from outside the queer community, respectively, yet both recognized or came to know their audiences as heterogeneous on some level. Director A noted the Safe Space trainings as "open to anyone," composed of "a lot of [university] faculty and staff," and that "I think a lot of it was targeted toward maybe [intergroup] allies'," although, "just because one [queer] person identifies with the community, there's other identities that they don't identify with that they could learn about as well." So while there was, and is, recognition that intragroup allies could be part of the audience, there is an overall expectation positioning the audience as non-queer, and non-trans.

When asked specifically if the manual was designed to change queer individuals' own perception of the LGBTQIA+ community, the directors' responses followed a similar pattern. Director Q responded, "Queer individuals, no. It was definitely designed and catered to educate the non-LGBT community." Director I responded "yes and no," noting parts of the manual that

follow our concept of informing—information presented for anyone—such as the Gender Unicorn (5) or pronouns chart (10), or pieces like "Beyond Marriage" (20) which he saw as "changing grief and problems to something that's maybe a little bit more celebratory." But he also generally felt, "I see parts and pieces of it, but I don't think the whole manual is designed to catalyze a change in queer perception." Director A viewed the manual most inclusively:

> It was about educating broadly even within our own community, because it's not a monolith obviously. There's all those letters [LGBTQIA+ and beyond in some cases], right? And you can identify with one or two or more of those letters but not usually all of them at the same time. And so how to educate folks even within our own community about each other and their experiences and to break down stereotypes...I think that was a part of it as well.

Again, directors note that there are some pieces of the manual that could inform an intragroup ally, but overall expectation is for the training of the intergroup ally.

Most pointedly, the interview asked directors if stating the SSM had a non-queer audience was a fair assessment. Here the responses drew a nearly unanimous conclusion. Director A stated:

> I could see that, I think a lot of it is training other people, thinking about how to make other folks create more inclusive community. I can see that it would be focused on that. I think a lot of times the constructions of these things, that is what is in mind. And then it's like yeah but also we have people within our own community who identify with other things, that you know would be great for them to learn—but I do think that is probably an accurate representation of how the thinking probably was at the time around the audience.

Director Q, concurred "Yeah, I agree [with the assessment of an intergroup audience]." Director O also understood the evaluation:

> I agree. And I don't know that's necessarily the right way, I would just say the intended audience ultimately...when queer students would come into the Center and they would be distraught about their own lived experience, whether it was in the classroom, or in their home lives, or with their friends, that's what really informed ultimately the need for the Safe Space trainings initially. Because people were saying, "My counterparts just don't understand me." And so the training was ultimately designed, initially, to educate straight counterparts of the queer community. The genesis of that is still very prominent today—or at least it was when I was training.

And Director I added,

> I mean, I would say yes, it probably does. And that is due to, truly, the history of the training, and even the placards too. So when placards were handed out, ally is part of the LGBTQIA. It just seemed really perplexing to me to do that. I've participated in a handful of Safe Space trainings, and none of them centered or had allies as part of it, and I felt that that was imperative to remove. So I would even say that the history still seeps into the current manual [laughs], the current iteration of the manual because of that context...But I would say, yeah, it totally does. It feels like it for sure might center or prioritize the lived experiences of those who are not part of the community.

For various reasons then, the manual audience is often positioned as an intergroup audience, even in the minds of LGBT Center directors. Again, we note Director I's most progressive views

as the current director of the Center, and most representative of the changing ideas surrounding "ally" in contemporary discussion.

Director Interview Analysis: Positioning through Pronouns

In advocating for a clearer SSM queer community inclusion, we might think that a queer community narrator affected by a "we"/"us"/"our" (e.g. "We, the queer community," "your allyship with us," "commitment to our causes") address would be useful. When asked about such a positioning, the directors were largely resistant to such an idea, for a number of reasons. Director I views the manual mostly as a "textbook" which informs without allowing for much "leniency...which [a lack of leniency] I don't find a problem with...while the text shares about nuance, I think there's aspects of it that don't allow the reader to question it, in a way of trying to invalidate it"—an understanding that a "we"/"us"/"our" ownership positioning might enable for in-group members. Director O was uncomfortable with the ability of such a "we"/"us"/"our" narrator positioning to speak inclusively:

> Using "we" can sometimes be problematic because it assumes that we all share a certain level of understanding, a certain level of experience, and that may not be true. I know from doing deep engagement with folks within the trans community that their lived experience and mine are very, very different...I can't use "we," in my opinion, because I think it dismisses the plight—the experience—of others.

The director most vocal about the connection between intergroup allies and the queer community, Director Q, had another view,

> The positioning in my manual was "How do we as a campus serve LGBT students." So there were multiple "we's." "We" as a campus, employees. "We" as allies. "We" as folks within the LGBT community. So there wasn't so much—like

> we're a "we," [subject campus], right? There wasn't this disconnect, this inner marginalized community disconnect.

So depending on a director and any distancing, or ownership, they want to build, a "we"/"us"/"our" manual narrator address to the audience might prove useful, but clearly the directors interviewed did not see deep value in such an address.

Director Interview Analysis: Inviting

All the directors spoke broadly of meeting participants where they are, and respecting participants'' current levels. But they also spoke more specifically of meeting participants where they are in relation to the manual invitation to readers to "Participate to your own comfort level" (1). This unconditional welcome applied to intergroup allies as well as intragroup, as directors related a desire to encourage those wholly new to the discussion of queer topics and rights, as well as to provide an environment where the queer individual would also feel able to just be, or to come out—if they felt ready for such a step. Director Q spoke of planting a seed, or digging deeper into introspection if the participant is ready:

> Everyone has got their own understanding, their own place—their own intellectual space and their own emotional space. And so, there are some places in the manual that you're engaging at an intellectual level, that's a little bit safer. And then there are some points where you really have an opportunity to self-reflect and look a little deeper and examine your own ideas and perceptions, and that's scary. And so, some people are more prepared to be able to do the scarier emotional work. And every one of those steps is part of the process. So if the person's role there was just to have a seed planted—fine. And then maybe someone else is further along in their ally development or identity development so

> they want to dig a little deeper. So, you know, everyone should have an opportunity to be where they're at.

Director O exhibited similar restraint in challenging trainees, in favor of meeting participants where they are, a "needling forward" toward more inclusive environments:

> Part of it is just trying to have your thumb or your finger on the pulse of where we're at in terms of generally speaking. Like what is the general public's relationship with queer identity at any point in given time? And then what does that mean about how we structure trainings and education to help move the needle forward and expand people's awareness, ultimately, with the goal of creating more inclusive, supportive environments.

Rhetorically, such invitational approaches function to create space for one to be informed rather than persuaded, to sit with new thinking and contemplate, rather than feel the pressure and aggression of a persuasive argument (Foss 5-6). However, Director I was able to see that this manual invitation "is potentially an 'out'" concerning allies and commitment—an interpretation we will return to in discussions of invitation.

This will conclude our overview of some director understandings of queer community allyship, and the Safe Space manual and its accompanying training. We will continue to hear from the directors as we broaden a discussion of our manual and director interview analyses alongside critique of the rhetorical effects of the manual's construction.

Chapter 6: Discussion

As we enter a discussion of how the Safe Space manual might evolve in future iterations, and the most pointed critique of the manuals we will reach, it bears stating that the intent and commitment of the LGBT Resource Center directors have never been in question. Side by Side feels confident that each director created the safest communities possible, armed with the best practices and thinking of the time of their tenure, and that their centers succeeded in queer community support.

All directors recognized an expansion in thought surrounding allyship and queer identities over time to the present day. While the investigation drew many of the following conclusions through manual analysis before speaking with the directors, several similar ideas were offered by the directors during their interviews demonstrating an understanding of a discrepancy between yesterday's manual and today's thought. Current Director I clearly already had a concern for reevaluating some of the manual constructions below.

Discussion: Intent in Construction

To illustrate the importance of intentional construction of the ally in the SSMs, let's look at two particular opportunities for the construction of the ally in the manuals. Oftentimes director opinions exhort the reflection of an ally in training, but we have begun to allude to a lack of charge in the manual ourselves. Yet, Director A noted efforts to encourage reflection on power, privilege, and intersectionality during training:

> Oh yeah, definitely. I think that was definitely a part of it. It was about reflecting on yeah, their privilege...You know we did trainings on other things through the center and we talked a lot about the intersections of identities and power and

> privilege. I think reflection on their own, on folks own privilege and their own experience in the world was part of what was included in the training.

Likewise, Director I discussed the definite occurrence of reflection during a training, with the important caveat that reflection didn't appear in the manual.

> Not within manual, but most definitely within the training. The manual supplements the training. There are pieces, like specifically cisgender privilege, where it lays out multiple cisgender privileges. In that section it doesn't task the reader to reflect on these in their own lives, but it just lays them out, kind of being there.

As Director I notes, "What is Cis-Gender Privilege?" (7) is informative; it mentions nothing about reflection on the page. While there are some calls to reflect in the manual, we agree that deep critical reflection is not explicitly encouraged by the manual alone—in fact, general director opinion supported a facilitation to truly affect reflection. So, while the directors in all cases ensured reflection would certainly happen during the facilitation of the training, one might ask why a concept of such importance is missing in some instances of actual text in the manual—its address in the complete manual/training pairing aside.

To further underscore the importance of intentional manual construction of concepts such as "the reflective ally," we note here that there is at least some director intent for the manual to be used away from a training. Director I has already described the manual as a "textbook" for us, and further describes the manual's main goal:

> to be a learning tool for those who are participating in Safe Space training. So like a learning take away tool is the big thing. Where not only can this be a learning tool during the training, but I really want people who come to the trainings to take

> that with them and use it as a sort of a reference guide for themselves and to refer back to it, so that's the main goal—is a learning referential take away tool.

Further, Director Q details a main goal of the manual: "I wanted participants to have a tangible guide that helps facilitate their own reflection, understand the LGBT community on at least a basic level, and then provide tangible tools and pathways to actively engage as an ally." She adds, "It was used as a guide to facilitate discussion and reference guide with tools to be an effective ally for the participants to refer back to."

A facilitated manual/training pairing is not the only imagined use of the manual even as detailed by some directors themselves then. So we return to our question: why is a subject of such importance, reflection, not mentioned, or explicitly called for, in the majority of the manual's text (in the case of critical reflection, *ever* mentioned)? At the very least, manual facilitation or mention of critical reflection in its actual text would serve later as a concrete reminder that doesn't rely on memory of a training facilitation. At present, the construction of a necessarily reflective ally is dependent upon a training facilitation, or strokes of fate. Whereas with a more intentional development of "the reflective ally" in the manual text, even the lone reader of the manual would understand the importance of the trait in an ally.

Alongside the absent critical reflection, we have a second example of the importance of explicit construction of concepts in the manual's address of queer community autonomy. The directors expressed intent to establish the queer individual as autonomous (apart from Director Q who expressed a vision characteristic of her responses of "interdependence" and "collaboration" between the queer community and its allies). Director A begins:

> I wish I could say we were thinking about that [autonomy] in a deep way...I don't think we were, that I was. Though at the time the Safe Space training was one

> thing that we were doing, in terms of the way we were thinking about the queer community and our allies...a lot of it was about empowering the community and a lot of energy was focused on the community separate from allies; it was building a lot of confidence and secureness in who we were—all of that I think was separate from the ally portion...the training in the manual was just focused on breaking down the stereotypes, you know understanding this piece and it wasn't so much about us, as just needing those allies to be who we were.

Director O expressed a similar lack of confidence in the intentionality of the manual construction of queer autonomy:

> I don't know that there was intentionality behind that [any positioning of a queer individual as dependent of, or autonomous from, a non-queer ally in the manual]...I think ultimately the goal is as facilitator you're wanting the queer individual to be autonomous—but I think depending on the person in the training and their own level of awareness, how they make sense of queer identity in that space will maybe have more significant influence on how they see that individual as autonomous or dependent.

Here we again see how leaving intent out of manual construction might affect the various interpretations of ally that will be produced in iterations of a training, or in one reader's mind as compared to the next reader.

Director I expressed an intent to augment queer autonomy similar to Directors A and O, "I don't think in that particular phrasing, but yes.[3] There were efforts to make the queer

[3] Interview question E.1.: Were efforts made to position the queer individual as autonomous from, or dependent on, allies in the manual?

individual unique in and of themselves and that their development is not dependent upon the support of others, especially non-queer folk." The discussions and reframings "to make the queer individual unique" referenced by Director I are present in the wording of the manual—but as we argue for a differentiation between recognizing a diversity of queer experiences and recognizing queer intersectionalities, we also argue here a difference between intrinsic uniqueness of being, and autonomy.

Our concern with the latter half of Director I's statement is that the meta message of the manual does not support it. As suggested by Peter Cardon in a discussion of tone and messaging, "meta messages are the overall but often underlying messages people take away from a communication or group of communications. Meta messages are encoded and decoded as a combination of content, tone, and other signals...Mixed signals occur when the content of a message conflicts with the tone, nonverbal communication, or other signals" (154).[4] There is no address of the audience as queer or non-queer in the manual *text*, but as we have begun to discuss, some manual constructions speak to an intergroup audience or intergroup power—there is meta messaging that speaks to a queer community without autonomy. As such, as indicated by Director O, a concept of queer community as autonomous from non-queer society might be dependent upon an individual or a facilitator. Intentional construction of the queer individual as autonomous, or a more limiting meta message concerning the power of the intergroup ally could complicate primary status quo frameworks and affect the understandings of autonomy, queer and trans communities, and allyship desired by three of our directors.

[4] While "nonverbal communication" is included in this quote, indicating spoken communication and its accompanying facial expressions or gestures for example, these ideas are pulled from Cardon's broader discussion of meta messaging in both written and spoken communications.

We have spent the past several pages discussing the examples of critical reflection and queer autonomy to illustrate how the construction, or lack of intentional construction, of the ally can affect a reading of the manual. Concepts important to a training may be left almost completely out of the manual text, or perhaps unintentionally presented as "information," when the intent for them is to "charge," as may be the case with critical reflection. Subtle topic messaging may also be subsumed by much louder meta messaging, as in the case of queer autonomy. Let's contemplate the utility of sophisticated rhetorical construction in resolving such situations as we continue discussion of the findings of our analyses.

Discussion: Positioning

Discussion: Subject Positioning and Subversive Stances

We have looked at concepts of "subject position" and "subversive stance," and of an "implied audience." We've also imagined how an audience member outside of the subject position or implied audience might be affected by such an exclusion in their response to the manual. Returning to these thoughts, we note Directors I and O were able to see an ambiguity in the construction of "ally" in the SSM, although neither felt the ambiguity was intentional. Director O elaborates:

> I don't know that it was intentional; I would agree that it's ambiguous. But I don't know that in the construction of the manual it was really that, "Let's make this ambiguous." You know, I think it just was, or is. And part of it is that ally is a *big* word. You know, on the surface people might assume that what it means is somebody "other." The challenge really is that as you get into the work, into the learning and you're unpacking—specifically in this case sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression—you begin seeing just how big ally can be.

> And so it ultimately needs to be ambiguous because there needs to be room under that umbrella for not just sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, but race, social identity...you know, the queer community doesn't own "ally."

Beyond ambiguity to definition as non-queer, earlier directors, Directors A and Q, did not see "ally" as ambiguous during their tenures or in their manuals. Director A reflected,

> I think it was the language we had at the time...I have such a different conceptualization of "ally" as a term and what that means now than I did at that time. My thinking has evolved, and listening to other people, as we've evolved, as language evolves over time...my sense is we probably didn't think it was ambiguous. Ally just for us meant you know, you were supportive of the community. I always felt like the bar was really low for being an ally to the LGBT community...an ally meant someone who didn't hate us.

Similarly, in Director Q's interpretation of "ally" from the manual, she states:

> I don't recall it being ambiguous in the manual I created. There's a list of definitions, there are definitions at the beginning and an ally was defined as a heterosexual who was supportive of an LGBT person, event, legislation, comma et cetera. So I think back then it wasn't ambiguous, it's become a little more ambiguous because now we have a deeper understanding of cisgender identity and how that intersects. So I think it wasn't intended to be ambiguous, and then as our knowledge and education has grown and developed, it's become ambiguous.

This ambiguity warrants discussion. In "The Problem of Speaking for Others," Linda Alcoff addresses power and position in discourse:

> …the neutrality of the theorizer can no longer, can never again, be sustained, not

> even for a moment…Who is speaking to whom turns out to be as important for meaning and truth as what is said…The rituals of speaking that involve the location of speaker and listeners affect whether a claim is taken as a true, well-reasoned, compelling argument, or a significant idea. Thus, how what is said gets heard depends on who says it, and who says it will affect the style and language in which it is stated, which will in turn affect its perceived significance (for specific hearers). (12-3)

As such, queer readers who take the SSM to be speaking from a non-queer viewpoint, or to a non-queer audience, may find themselves othered or marginalized—hardly a pattern we want to continue or enforce in a manual focused on safe space. The queer audience may also feel represented by someone outside of their own community if the speaker is perceived as non-queer. The speaker's perspective, as Alcoff indicates, will certainly affect the reception and understanding of the manual and "ally" for all readers. Recalling Barry Brummett's discussion of subject positions and subversive stances can help us understand the consequence of this reception. Again, Brummett presents the subject position as who the text is made for, who fits most easily into its audience, the "subject position is who the text encourages you to be as you, the reader or audience, experience that text" (129). If we can accept that the SSMs through the constructions we are exploring have an ambiguous reader at best, and a non-queer reader at the most limited, then Brummett's counterpart to the subject position, the subversive stance, is consequential. Brummett explores how the subversive stance exists in opposition to the "subject position suggested most strongly." Here the reader finds reason to reject the subject position perceived as intended for the audience. If a queer individual reading the manual does not feel included by an ambiguous interpretation of ally in the text, or excluded by a non-queer

interpretation of ally, they are put into a subversive stance and may feel limited in participation, ability, or value by the text. This may cause them to disregard, delegitimize, or reject the manual in part or in whole.

Director A pointed to an evolution of the term ally in her own mind over time, and each director alluded to a similar process. A reading of "ally" from the manuals however, remains largely the same as its reading 20 years ago (with an intergroup ally subject position). Therefore, based on both manual language and director descriptions of "ally," we have either a construction of "ally" in the manual that remains ambiguous, or who is conceptualized as a queer community intergroup ally—leaving the queer reader apt to take a subversive stance.

Discussion: Inviting

The admittedly murky task of addressing, recruiting, and motivating allies without over-empowering them is one of the most difficult for the manual. Use of an invitational rhetoric that recognizes the value of the ally and creates a pathos of comfort is understandable to achieve the above goals, as well as to aid in the "informing" process. However, as with any rhetorical move, we must evaluate its appropriateness for the situation, and the effects of its alternatives as well. In the case of our manual, the text recognizes the "equality, immanent value, and self-determination" central to Foss and Griffin's discussion of an invitational rhetoric (4), but we are unsure it does so for the queer community, as it does for the intergroup ally, in its constructions. As addressed by McAlister's "Ten Propositions" from our discussion of Space, there is an exigency for the queer community that does not exist for its non-queer counterparts (116). In analogy, a strong swimmer firmly footed in an agile skiff must risk more than a wave and cheer of encouragement for the weak swimmer quickly losing energy in the midst of a river's roiling waters—neither their level of danger nor their level of resource is equal, and an invitation to

"participate to your own comfort level" in the rescue of the failing swimmer may well not be asking enough. While McAlister has discussed the shrinking of space perceived by some privileged populations in today's decolonizing explorations of space and discourse, it would be premature to state that these privileged communities have already lost a significant amount of space or privilege, even if conversations have begun to move away from ally comfort. Contrary to any thought of privileged populations losing space, and in accord with Self's suggestion for the potential of SSMs rising from homonormative concepts and status quo thought, we will explore several of Director I's comments that LGBT resource centers—and identity centers broadly, as well as the SSM—are born in and from systems of privilege, which they unintentionally maintain.

While we acknowledge that issues surrounding queer and trans concerns remain difficult topics for many individuals, and that there is a good deal of ignorance and a lot of questions surrounding those concerns—both on the part of queer and non-queer communities—we question the efficacy of such an invitational allowance in relation to the imbalanced distribution of power to queer and non-queer populations in contemporary society. As such, and in light of privilege and power dynamics, we are unsure that an invitational rhetoric as applied in the manuals is the most appropriate rhetorical address.

Discussion: Informing

Neutral informing of an audience importantly delimits the reader's understanding of themself as necessarily queer or non-queer. This is an important director treatment in the manual to open the audience's understanding of itself to someone other than a heteronormative individual (an understanding we maintain much of the manual does encourage). However, a

neutral informing is, of course, neutral—it can only go so far in counteracting the meta messaging of the more enabled intergroup ally, and the secondary queer community.

We reiterate as well that pieces of the manual stop with informing the reader. Where deeper reflections on topics such as privilege, or development of specific personal action plans could exist, new information sits alone at times with no call to action for its use.

Discussion: Instructing

The Safe Space manual seems to most create a divide and to speak to a non-queer audience in its instruction of how to be ally. Our discussion below helps illuminate how this rhetorical choice of audience manifests itself in the cultivation of the intergroup ally as a savior to the queer community, an embodiment of safety outside of the queer community, and a maintenance of status quo relationships.

Discussion: Instructing through Prepositions

The text offers particular wordings that contribute to a subtle meta messaging; here we look at several examples of distancing language, and discuss how we might limit the use of prepositions that will imply a dominant, empowered, or non-queer ally aiding a dependent queer community member. Some prepositions, for instance, are actually avoidable and can be eliminated. Others can be exchanged for less distancing alternatives with rekeying wording. Let's consider the following statements from the manuals, in which all emphases are added:

1. "The first function [of the Safe Space program] is to identify and mobilize a network of faculty, staff, students and community members who are supportive and knowledgeable about queer issues and concerns in order to provide a greater sense of safety **for** the queer community" (2).
2. "Above all it is important to send the message **out to** trans people **in our** communities

that they are welcome, appreciated, and that transphobia will not be tolerated" (9).

3. "Explore how you are different **from** and similar **to** queer people" (17).

What literal sentence constructions, and figurative "ally" constructions, might alleviate some othering and indication that the queer community is receiving a service? Below we propose some alternatives to the manual language for consideration.

1. *"The first function [of the Safe Space program] is to identify and mobilize a network of faculty, staff, students and community members who are supportive and knowledgeable about queer issues and concerns in order to provide a greater sense of* ***queer community safety****."* We are able to remove "for" with no issue and have tied "queer community" directly to "safety," indicating an ownership. In the replacement phrase, the queer community becomes more focal and more a part of "providing" safety rather than existing as the object of an action, and owns its own safety (speaking also to autonomy).
2. *"Above all,* ***saturate all communities with inclusive Trans folk messaging****."* The original statement (2) had two prepositional issues: indicating that a message must leave my (presumably non-trans) self to reach the trans community, and that the trans community is existing **in** my community, not **as a part** of it. By removing these phrasings, community ownership is eliminated, and the reader may or may not be a part of the trans community—all individuals are working from the same area toward the same goal. Ownership of the messaging has also been attributed to the trans community in the revision.
3. *"Explore* ***your similarities and differences among the gamut of queer experiences****."* Finally, in (3), separation is again indicated by prepositions. If the reader is exploring

differences from and similarities to the queer community, they are positioned as one outside of that community. By reworking this statement we indicate that anyone can have similarities and/or differences with the infinite experiences of those who identify under the queer umbrella. The reader may or may not identify as queer and feel addressed by, and be able to relate to, the statement.

These reworkings are likely imperfect themselves, as our dichotomous thinking concerning alterity is nearly impossible to avoid, but we suggest that these modifications and others similar to them can help *reduce* an othering and power differentials in SSM language. While prepositions are tiny pieces of information in English, the meaning they convey can be considerable. They also pervade our language—focus and intention are necessary to recognize their use and the meaning they construct. As illustrated above though, there are reasonably simple alternatives to othering constructions that otherwise limit the queer individual's agency, or cast the ally as a savior or non-queer individual.

Discussion: Instructing through Imperatives - Assertive and Receptive Verbs

We have just explored how prepositions may inadvertently create a separation between manual reader and a queer community member, let's look now at the positioning of power through assertive verbiage in a few manual phrases which may maintain a queer/non-queer dichotomy and support concepts of saviorship among intergroup allies. All emphases to the examples have again been added.

1. **"Consider** Trans People when Announcing Events" (9).
2. **"Include** Trans People in Worker Contracts and Laws" (9).
3. **"Acknowledge** their Experience" (9).

4. **"Validate** their feelings and exhibit empathy" (15).

Any empowerment found in these assertive verbs is tempered by contextualizing information following the instruction, such as the text following "Include" example two above: "It is currently legal in most areas to discriminate on the basis of gender expression and/or identity. Allies have the opportunity to help by advocating and implementing explicit protection for trans workers and citizens" (9). Even so, as these directives for the ally all focus on how I (the ally) will treat a trans individual, what might rekey the concept of "ally" to one who only participates in wholly and autonomously valid life experiences, rather than acting upon them?

1. *Announce events inclusively.* While the power to consider or not consider is not entirely removed from the equation (the ally will still act inclusively, exclusively, or in maintenance of the status quo), the focus is shifted to an action in the ally's own life. Rather than a focus on "what I do to trans people from my positioning," the ally's role is more limited to "what I do." The community to which the ally belongs or does not belong is not implied. The reader could as easily be a trans individual themself, working on their own inclusionary language.
2. *Write Inclusive Worker Contracts and Laws*. As with the above example, the power of inclusion or exclusion is lessened in the phrasing, and the ally is only instructed in how to act inclusively in their own life. The community to which the ally belongs or does not belong is not implied.
3. *Listen to their Experiences when Asked.* Here the power to acknowledge or leave unacknowledged is not ascribed to the ally, rather their role becomes a reaction to a trans individual acting, not an action of an ally upon a trans individual.

4. *Engage in Validating Conversations and Empathize.* In this new construction it is not the ally that brings validation to the conversation, but rather helps the queer community member explore and build upon any validity and intrinsic value that member may already feel concerning themself.

We return to Benjamin's discussion from "Beyond Doer and Done To" to continue exploring the import of such constructions: "If the analyst...gives from a position of pure complementarity (the one who knows, heals, remains in charge), the patient will feel that because of what the analyst has given him, the analyst owns him...Further, the patient has nothing to give back, no impact or insight that will change the analyst" (14). Thus it is worth styling Safe Space manuals in a manner that does not focus on assertive actions of complementing, more empowered, individuals positioned outside the queer or trans community. A focus on communal effort, or as allies as participants in, rather than leaders or saviors of, another's cause will be more validating for a queer reader. Focusing specifically on Benjamin's "the patient has nothing to give back," we see that the queer individual in today's hegemony has no reciprocal power equal to what a non-queer individual might "give" to them. What need does the intergroup ally have for a queer individual to "validate" them, "acknowledge" them, or "include" them in legislation? The status quo has satisfied each of these needs already.

As we begin to close our discussion of instruction through parts of speech such as prepositions and imperatives, we note: in a culture where a gay man may still be judged or admonished for a swish in his walk or a lisp in his speech, where children are often encouraged to wear the clothing or hairstyles "appropriate" for their assigned biological sex, or where queer and trans individuals are physically assaulted and killed, we see the embodiment of our identities, and the effects of power on them. In a discussion of embodiment and power, Diana

Coole asserts "it is important to recognise that the body's appearances are always mediated by culture and society" (417). Our interactions with one another are heavily influenced by our bodies: recognition (e.g. of a person, a race, a presumed gender), proximity, body language, and physical contact are examples of these influences—as is the propensity to define the alter through the body: physical ability, skin tone, the genitals we have or don't have in relation to our gender identity, or the genitals we do or do not desire in relation to our own. Considering the space we have discussed and the embodiment of agency and safety, it is worth contemplating even the smallest parts of speech that may maintain a hegemony. If, as a queer individual, I read the Safe Space manual and see safety and its creation housed and delegated to only intergroup allies, then I continue to see my own body as unsafe and without agency. The manual has not afforded me safety or actions to take to create safety. I feel a need for proximity to the ally, to enter their sphere, to pass below their Safe Space placard to find safety. It is necessary to move my body to a place of safety, as I find my body and its safety constructed as dependent on the ally. If the language of the manual does not address, acknowledge, or empower me (as might be argued of our SSM at times, even for the homonormative queer), then the Safe Space manual itself is ironically not a safe space for me—it is for someone else, and only in that individual can I find safety. Coole continues:

> an analysis of bodies within concrete political situations must combine phenomenological attention to the sensuous and symbolic ways actors experience their own bodies, with attention to the structures of power that circumscribe this experience. The latter must in turn both pay attention to material or discursive structures that categorise and stratify bodies on a macro level and undertake more detailed, genealogical investigations of the way anonymous micropowers help

> produce experiences and discipline performances within particular contexts. (417)

Therefore, even prepositions and verbs must be considered in the styling of manual discourse, as they position the queer individual as a reader of the manual, or not, as an empowered being, or not. As noted by the manual itself, "using inclusive language is a first step to creating a safe environment" (18).

We suggest this look at language can move beyond nomenclature to the structure of the manual's sentences and directives. At the level of verbs, prepositions, or pronouns, one might feel we are being particular and splitting hairs—and if we had only one category of disempowering language, or were society in the U.S. not already heavily biased against the queer community, we might be inclined to agree. However, as we have several instances of several categories of language that can reduce queer community agency, such linguistic structuring and positioning affects a style which becomes pervasive and we see a pattern of marginalization and dependency emerging. As some individuals are experiencing the manual as their introduction to queer issues and advocacy, the ethos of the manual and the LGBT Resource Center behind it is considerable, and the construction of every aspect of allyship is consequential.

Discussion: Charging

During our analysis of the manual, we have struggled with a distinction between the "instruction" and the "charge" that we find. If the manual is "instructing," then is it not "charging" the ally? We see some difference here, and argue that while it achieves the former, that it wrestles more with completing the latter. While the manual informs and instructs its readers on allyship, we feel a certain lack of commitment to change ascribed by the manual to a non-queer audience—despite introduction to new concepts, and ally actions and responsibilities. We have brushed up against this "lack of commitment" in our previous discussions as we've

questioned the manual's "invitation," the manual's (and therefore the ally's) examination of an empowered positioning of the ally, or the manual's lack of critical reflection.

The seeming paradox may arise from a manual somewhat focused on only looking out at the problems facing the queer community, rather than also looking into one's self to create change and safety there as well. That is to say, the manual equips the reader with new information, awareness of a broader spectrum of queer community members, knowledge of heteronormative and cisgender privilege, and actions to take as an ally. These and similar moves complete informing and instructing, and we cannot argue that these elements will create change in the reader—even if that change would be limited to an extension of vocabulary. They speak to a level of charging—they do not move, however, to the level of recognizing oneself as an agent of privilege. Recall Director I's discussion of the "What is Cis-Gender Privilege?" page (7): "In that section it doesn't task the reader to reflect on these in their own lives, but it just lays them out, kind of being there." The ally isn't asked to explore the significance of those privileges, the construction of the ally seems to stop short of anything to urge, or even suggest, that the reader of the manual *act* upon what they now know about privilege and their own positioning, and raises questions about the rhetorical effects of simply informing and instructing. In a discussion of critical self-reflection, Brookfield suggests, "Learning about oppression or ideological domination...is not just a theoretical exercise" (*The Power of Critical Thinking* 271). He lays out four steps to critical thinking: "(1) identifying the assumptions that frame our thinking and determine our actions, (2) checking out the degree to which these assumptions are accurate and valid, (3) looking at our ideas and decisions (intellectual, organizational, and personal) from several different perspectives, and (4) on the basis of all this, taking informed actions" (*Teaching for Critical Thinking* 1). We are unsure that the manual's largely invitational and informing

rhetorical approach moves the reader beyond Brookfield's first step. Inter- and intragroup allies must also take the time to sit with themselves and examine their privilege. They must not only develop actions to take in reaction to inequality and hegemony, but also those reflective skills that will help them proactively recognize how their positioning is enabled by an unjust system, and how a maintenance of their own lifestyle, habits, and comfort may contribute to that system.

Where we will have to limit the manual charge then, to delineate responsibilities the ally will assume, surfaces in the more internal, ethical charge of the ally. It is true there are values, culture, and ethics exhorted by the manual, concepts such as awareness (1), understanding (17), or assertion or protection (18)—and again, accepting these values as worthwhile will cause change in the manual's readers, and will benefit the queer community. But here we think back to the beginning of our study, and back to Goffman and his theory of primary frameworks—to one's assumptions—in this case, about the ally and the queer community. If manual creators continue to subscribe to concepts of "ally," "queer community," and the relation of the two from twenty-year-old discussions of community and advocacy of queer rights, then those frames will build "ally" in the manual—along with the assumptions inherent to those frames. If the manual was built within a framework of "ally immanent value and unconditional welcome" over "queer community immanent value and actual community threat," then that assumption will pervade manual workings without the developer's conscious recognition of it.

Therefore, the charge that the manual cannot give—the change it cannot effect—lies within its own assumptions: e.g. assumptions of the ally as non-queer, or assumptions of little to no queer community autonomy. If the manual and its concept of "ally" has been built upon warrants such as a necessity for intergroup allies, privilege as an issue of ally awareness alone, or intergroup ally immanent value irrespective of the performance of "ally" or the queer

community's immanent value, then the manual cannot ask the reader to confront those ideas, or contemplate alternatives to such thought. The manual itself remains unaware of these frameworks and cannot facilitate discussion of them, or reflection on them—that is to say, the manual cannot encourage critical reflection on issues it does not see as issues. As we have examined, some manual constructions seem to exhibit such blind spots.

Discussion: Treatment of Privilege

There is a presentation of privilege as a topic of concern in the writing of the manuals, but critical reflection on one's privilege is not encouraged in the manuals alone. While the directors stressed the necessity of reflection, without training facilitation one might simply read about privilege, and short passages on reflection, in the manual without exploring the significance of either. Recall here Fingerhut's and Grzanka et al.'s research into the recognition of privilege as an important piece of ally development (Fingerhut 2244, Grzanka et al. 181-2), especially Fingerhut's demonstration of the importance of an exploration of one's own privilege in producing more active allies. The examples we will discuss next, from "Goals" (1), "Becoming an Ally" (17), and "How to Be an Ally" (18) do aid in "recognition of privilege," but do they advocate for an "exploration of one's own privilege"? While we have praised an informational style for certain parts of the manual, in the treatment of privilege, we see an invitation to inform oneself alone (we consider "recognition of privilege" to be an "informing") to be insufficient. In sections such as "Norms" and "Goals" (1), "How to Be an Ally" (18), or "Safe Space Responsibilities" (29), trainees are charged with the responsibilities of allyship, but we do not see a reflection on privilege or positionings as a part of those responsibilities. While the manuals provide discussion of privilege, it is again informative, but not tasking.

In a second consideration of the manual's treatment of privilege, we examine the manual's instructions that do concern reflection, of which Side by Side identified four.

1. "Examine your personal knowledge and feelings about queer people" (1).
2. "To be an effective ally, it is important for people to reflect upon and understand their own beliefs and attitudes about the Queer community" (17).
3. "Explore how you are different from and similar to queer people" (17).
4. "Know thyself: be aware of what your own thoughts and ideas are on Queer issues" (18).

We find quotes (2) and (3) in "Becoming an Ally," a piece of the manual not tied directly to a discussion of privilege.

The inclusion of these responsibilities might seem to speak against our point, they seem to call for reflection. However, note that while the reader is tasked with better understanding their "beliefs and attitudes," they are not tasked with better understanding their own positioning or privilege, or what actions could alleviate its negative effects on less privileged identities and communities—they are not asked to explore the significance of their discoveries or to manage privilege. We make an argument that all four charges to "reflect" deal again mostly with ensuring an informed ally over a truly reflective ally ready to affect change to an imbalanced social structure, and propose that the manual could include more direct calls to critically reflect, act, and perhaps sacrifice.

In support of such a revision, Gardner notes that: "Empirical examinations of the effectiveness of allies suggests that indeed, through the acknowledgment of one's privilege and *the concerted application of that advantage,* allies can effectively confront prejudice" (196, emphasis added). It is connection to this "concerted application of advantage" we feel may be

lacking in the manual's charge (How do I apply my advantage is support of queer and trans causes? How do I check advantage in my own actions?). However, Gardner also continues: "Because ally trainings are framed toward personal development and growth, the message conveyed is one of support rather than criticism. This characteristic is likely to decrease the defensive affect that would be present otherwise, further leading to an increase in effectiveness and potential for greater buy in from trainees" (197). We understand this likely pedagogical approach to the manual's construction, and do not advocate for a shaming, blaming, or guilting experience for the reader. A check-in with reality does not have to shame, blame, or guilt, however, it can simply state what is—maintenance of our lives and habits as less marginalized allies likely maintains unequal treatment of those we would ally.

For another caveat to our argument for charge, we turn to Poynter's "Safe Zones." Poynter describes a situationally-reactive approach to ally training: "Each training program should be specific to the goals of their program and the assessed needs of the campus" (125). A more charging, pointed address of an audience may not fit into the goals of a program or the needs of a campus—a printed text cannot tailor itself to the specific audience of a training or a reading, and as such, we might legitimize a lighter approach of the manual. But Poynter also notes: "Most LGBT Safe Space Ally programs only require that members attend an initial training, display a sticker or sign, and provide a 'safe' environment. While a mandatory training provides a strong foundation, ongoing educational opportunities are required to better understand and provide appropriate resources for a complex and diverse LGBT community" (129). Safe Space training at the subject university takes such a "one-and-done" approach; it does not necessitate "ongoing educational opportunities." Likewise, the manual has one chance to accomplish all of its goals. Even if reread, the information it presents is static. Some

opportunities to reflect exist in the manual, but we ask again if they do more than create an "informing" of the reader. While an informing may cause critical reflection and action for a reader, it is less likely to do so then more direct lines of questioning and calls to manage privilege. Thus, any attempt to create deep reflection must be taken.

In short, as we begin closing discussion of the manual's charge, we are unsure that the manual's calls to recognize privilege, although not wholly absent, are as far as the manual could go. Returning to Benjamin's "Beyond Doer and Done To," we find discussion of the navigation of a relationship where hurt has been, or is, involved—such as the contemporary marginalization of queer and trans communities to the benefit of heteronormative and cisgender populations—"An important relational idea for resolving impasses is that the recovery of subjectivity requires the recognition of our own participation. Crucially, this usually involves surrendering our resistance to responsibility, a resistance arising from reactivity to blame" (11). Director I notes, the manual "does sometimes overly center the ally instead of the queer and trans community," and such a centering may put comfort before responsibility. Benjamin speaks of "the recovery of subjectivity"—*not* remaining objective, *not* simply informing oneself, *not* remaining blameless—but getting into the "hurt," the "participation," and the "responsibility" of the matter—owning complicity. The manual need not place blame or guilt upon the reader, but it can still speak plainly about the realities of privilege, about how our action or inaction affects privilege and inequality. Certainly allies are not evil individuals or particularly to blame for the structural inadequacies of our society. Certainly this researcher is complicit himself. We must all recognize our role in maintaining the status quo, and any motivation for maintenance we may possess if beneficiaries of it. To leave fledgling allies out of equations of power does not open the complexity of the issue to them, and does less complete work to advance queer rights.

Chapter VII: Recommendations

Side by Side recognizes the challenges inherent in bridging an alterity and creating consubstantiality, that the beginning of Director A's tenure is 22 years ago, and that each director of the Center has been a dedicated professional focused on best practices for the support of the queer community at the subject university. The Safe Space manual through time has worked to welcome allies into a partnership and a space that could well be uncomfortable for them. In those 22 years, however, times and discussions have changed, and we propose it is time for the manual's discourse to catch up. We offer the following recommendations for SSM development as responses to manual issues suggested throughout this paper.

Audience

Side by Side has postulated that the audience of the manual is a heteronormative, cisgender audience. The directors had little resistance to this assertion. As the director interviews explored the history of the Safe Space program, it became clear that there was initial intention in this construction. A renewed examination of the manual's primary and implied audience would help create a more inclusive and contemporary reading of the manual, and broader understandings of "ally," as well as of the constituents of the queer community.

The interview with Director I revealed an ongoing campaign to eliminate "othering" language—indeed, Director I's iteration of the manual (edition three) has removed one instance

of "these people" that prompted an interview question on specific othering language,[5] discussion, and response—so this work has begun:

> We've tried, again, to remove othering language. It has been a battle to find othering language in a lot of the material of the center since I've been the director and put in words like "additional people" or "additional identities," and it's just been really, really hard. And I'll find it sometimes when I'm doing trainings. I'm like "Oh crud, this is not supposed to say this, like, this is not what we're doing now!—but it's still there.

Therefore, we note both the concern and the ongoing search to delimit audience, and we encourage continued work in inclusive audience and address.

Creating a focus group or focus groups before publishing the next manual might prove useful in accomplishing such goals. Groups of intergroup and intragroup allies, queer and trans community members could be accessed for their impressions of the manual's audience address, as well as its lessons in relation to the concerns below.

Explicit Discussion of Key Topics

Several discussions seem to be missing from the manual or stop short at informing, as the directors rely on the training to develop some topics for their Safe Space audiences. These limited discussions include topics like those on intersectionality, reflection, and responsibility. As there is specific director intent, and other general possibilities, for individuals accessing the

[5] Interview question E.4.: At times queer individuals are referred to as "these people," the participant is guided to do things "to" or "for" a queer individual or the queer community, or they are instructed to "validate," or "include" a queer individual or community. Can you comment on these constructions in building a participant's concept of the ally?

manual outside of a training however, it is important that any reader access key concepts of a full training, and learn to reflect on their own positioning, even if alone.

For instance, we suggest addressing intersectionality throughout the manual, in addition to its own limited discussion at the end of the manual, just as trans issues, or gender and sexuality considerations have been allotted space throughout the manual. While we hope that other suggestions for altering the meta message of the manual will contribute to an understanding of intersectionality, naturally, a direct discussion of the topic will do the most to underscore its importance in queer community discourse. Direct calls to self-reflection and recognition of participation in the status quo would be other important candidates for more explicit discussion—even minimal additions of text could better frame reflecting on privilege as a necessary responsibility and could change the manual's somewhat laissez-faire tone.

As Director I has described the manual as a "textbook," as it progresses it could feature questions for general reflection, and reflection on one's involvement with privilege, comprehension questions, and application questions toward its goals. "Post-Closeted Culture" (21*) has been removed from the third edition, but offered questions such as "When do [sic] you first realize your sexual orientation and how did you know?' and "How do you foresee your role as an ally continuing to evolve?" Reintegration of similar reflective and thought-provoking questions could aid an interactive reading of the text, and help construct a concept of "ally" as a role of action rather than one of primarily knowledge building.

To limit the invention of concepts of "ally" and ally responsibilities to a necessary interaction with a facilitator does not capitalize on, or imagine, Aristotle's envisioning of rhetoric as "the faculty of discovering, in any particular case, all of the available means of persuasion." The manual itself might be imagined as a "means of persuasion," an interlocutor, and maker of

meaning—as it likely will be these, if less often than the manual/training pairing will be. In ensuring that a manual reader find discussion of who an ally might be, the communities they might come from, or the privilege they may hold, we begin deconstructing the more monolithic "ally" conceptualizations of the manual.

The presence of such topic discussion in the manual text as a facilitation guide will also aid in a more consistent live training experience.

Style

Subtle uses of language contribute to what we consider to be the address of the manual to a heteronormative, cisgender community. Prepositions, assertive verbs, and pronouns all play a role in this understanding of the manual's "ally."

A review of the positioning of the queer and non-queer communities in relation to one another through prepositions can often be eliminated, or the distancing lessened by attentive rewordings. Not only can distancings of the two groups be diminished, but queer autonomy and ownership of causes can be enhanced.

A reframing of the ally as a participant in, rather than a director/provider of queer authority and safety could be worked by guiding ally actions through receptive verbs rather than ally-empowering assertive verbs. When allies are instructed through imperatives, the use of assertive verbs that empower the ally to act upon the queer community can be removed and replaced by receptive verbs that encourage the ally to act in response to, or in tandem with, the queer community's needs and actions.

The use of a neutral address and pronouns such as "one" at times proves useful in the manual in its delimiting of audience members. Continued and expanded use of neutral address can help reduce the interpretation of a non-queer ally audience and eliminate us vs. them, or

queer vs. non-queer constructions. Directors might capitalize on neutral address of the audience by using it to more extensively play down power dynamics and positionings. This clinical address might serve well more broadly applied in the manual as the audience will be heterogeneous and have differing levels of experience with LGBTQIA+ community concerns, as discussed by each director.

That said, a clinical address may be inappropriate for more emotionally charged or reflective sections of the manuals. At such times a direct "you"/"you"/"your" address might help position the reader more intimately with the topic under consideration, helping to forge a more personal connection or clearer exigence. Likewise, overuse of the neutral address could lead to more manual and "ally" ambiguity. Situational evaluation would be necessary.

"Ally"

It is time to key "ally" to fit contemporary conversations. This means an ambiguous reference to the ally should become less so. The manual can introduce discussion of "intragroup" and "intergroup"—as a start. While only a beginning, these terms may help us see "ally" as diverse, and the queer community as diverse. Kimberlé Crenshaw illuminates the effect of this "seeing," "Where there's no name for a problem, you can't see a problem, and when you can't see a problem, you pretty much can't solve it" (The Urgency of Intersectionality 8:38-8:49). In this discussion, Crenshaw is addressing the issue of the invisibility of intersectionality, and we wish to maintain this broader concern as a reference point in our discussion. Intersectional concerns of the queer community remain mostly invisible in the manual due to its limited vision of "ally." The manual has not problematized a singular view of the ally, which maintains binary thoughts of allies and queer community members. Recognizing that a queer community member can be an

ally within their own community begs the questions of "How?", and opens the door to an exploration of a more thorough understanding of queer identities.

Given other manual indicators, such as invitational rhetoric and linguistic separations of a queer and non-queer community, as well as considering a human propensity to fall back unconsciously on old and familiar structures—the concept of "ally" must be explicitly complicated for a diverse manual audience in pursuit of the recognition of the many manifestations of queer identity, queer autonomy, intersectionality, and new understandings of queer community support.

A rather open and comprehensive definition of "ally" existed in our first two editions in the "Terms and Definitions" of those editions (27*). It is inexplicably removed from the third edition. Director I, who oversaw the revisions leading to edition three, was unsure how or why this happened. He postulated either growing Center discomfort with the term "ally," or simple oversight. Either way we feel the reintroduction of the term and its generous definition are important to a broad understanding of "ally." If "ally" is no longer palatable, we encourage the addition of "advocate," which Director I suggested as a preferable option. Either term defined alongside an equally, explicitly diverse interpretation as featured in the previous editions' "ally" would be a powerful focus for the reader.

We also feel that an early manual look at an inclusive "ally" (as well as its inclusion in any glossary) would help frame conversations in an understanding of possibilities for allyship, and intersectional challenges within the queer and trans communities. The manual might include such a discussion among its first pages or topics.

Invitational Rhetoric

Contributing to the desire directors expressed to meet participants where they are, Director I commented on the manual's invitation to "participate to your own comfort level,"

> The intent behind that particular phrase is that there is content that we will go over that may bring up particular narratives or lived experiences which may create some sense of discomfort. We do have activities where we ask people to talk from lived experiences, and there may be times where it may touch a nerve in which—or a memory—that they have a sense of discomfort with.

This intent is understood, and a respect for experiences, especially traumas, is vital. But we maintain that while looking at privilege and intersections, privileged individuals may need to be pushed a bit more out of their comfort zones, and that the actual continued traumas of queer and trans communities must take precedence over more simple conversational "discomfort." Director O spoke to the value in challenging attendees,

> Sometimes I would actively be digging in to try to create discomfort because I ultimately learned comfort is something that we all seek, familiarity is something that we all seek—but ultimately that doesn't typically open up or expand or deepen learning. It's really those moments where you're thrust kind of off your equilibrium that causes you to have to think critically about something, that maybe expands or opens up your worldview a bit and shifts it. When you're comfortable there's nothing inspiring that to occur.

Here Director O suggests, as we have, a violation of a simply invitational rhetoric, a move we feel is important to future iterations of the manual. Alongside a reevaluation of manual audience, we encourage a reevaluation of a largely invitational rhetoric, and the consideration of dialogue

that further explores the continuing exigency of threat to the queer and trans communities, and pushes participants more aggressively toward dissatisfaction with the status quo.

While a more demanding invitation than "participate to your own comfort level" may be advised on some levels, we have the paradox of SSMs wishing to welcome allies, so a recognition of ally hardships (a recognition of the challenges of serving a group outside of your own) may prove useful in softening those demands. Robert Reason and Ellen Broido address concerns that allies may encounter in their experiences of allyship in "Issues and Strategies," concerns such as: segregation from both the ally's group and the group they'd ally, maintenance of motivation, or the challenge of recognizing one's own privileges (82-7). So, the manuals must simultaneously encourage and limit the concept of "ally." While allies can add to a community in ways that a community itself might be unable to, by acting as saviors to that community, allies might also strain intergroup relationships and perpetuate the status quo. In constructing an identity of "ally," SSMs can recognize the unique hardships of allyship and offer counsel in the labyrinthine role that allies take on, without offering carte blanche in addressing a community outside one's own.

While we have somewhat maligned Foss and Griffin's invitational rhetoric in our evaluation of the Safe Space manual, we do believe in its tenets of equality, immanent value, and self-determination. To operationalize a less invitational rhetoric in the manual, we don't suggest that the manual should violate the ally's equality, immanent value, or self-determination, but rather critically examine what their maintenance may entail in an inherently unequal system. To whom is the ally "equal"? If they were equal to the allied, would there be a need for allyship? Is their immanent value in question? As the focal audience of the manual and, at times, savior to the queer community, we propose an ally's immanent value is recognized and celebrated. By

suggesting the manual push the ally to be more dissatisfied, more uncomfortable, with the status quo, we do not hope for a violating experience for the ally, but for an examination of their self-determination. Referring back to our raging river analogy, the resources available to, and the threat to, the ally and allied in our society are unequal. The ally's self-determined choice to abstain from action is not consequential to the ally so much as to the allied. We simply recommend the manual ask some of these more difficult questions of its readers without violating their immanent value or goodwill in allyship. These questions may well make them uncomfortable—but if we are to talk "equality," then the bullied trans student or physically assaulted queer woman of color is most assuredly "uncomfortable" too. If the manual prioritizes the equality, immanent value, and self-determination of an already privileged group over those they would ally—is it training its readers to do anything more than maintain hegemony?

Messaging and Meta Messaging Consistency

If autonomizing and empowering the queer community are values of the Center, its training, and its manual, then a consistent messaging must be constructed. As it is, considering the manual alone, while important conversations about queer autonomy are part of the manual's discussion, the message of those discussions is obscured by an opposing manual meta message about who the ally is (intergroup) and the power that ally has in respect to the queer community. While the manual encourages a development of queer community understanding, safety and autonomy, the text itself maintains a separation of queer and non-queer communities and an imbalanced power dynamic in line with contemporary hegemony. To address this inconsistency, the manual audience can be expanded, for instance, or power differentials examined in manual imperatives.

Likewise, intentional construction of the ally, inter- or intragroup, could help alleviate this issue by speaking explicitly to allyship in terms of support of autonomous queer, trans, and intersectional individuals.

In closing our recommendations, let's look to "What is the Purpose of the 'Safe Space' Program" to read Safe Space's mission statement: "The overall mission of this program is to:

1. Raise awareness of queer issues.

2. Pledge a commitment to fostering an environment that is devoid of discrimination based on one's sexual orientation, sexual identity, or gender identity" (2).

Examining if the manual achieves these goals, we would suggest the manual meets the first goal without issue. From gender and identity issues, to trans issues, even to concerns of privilege, the reader will leave the manual more aware of any of these, and others. As we have discussed, they will certainly be informed.

As to the second goal, we feel a new ally's "commitment," the charge they receive, has a limit. Promising to become more knowledgeable as individuals, to grow safe spaces, and to work to challenge homophobia and transphobia are commendable and substantial agreements. Especially those actions like confronting homophobic or transphobic conversations might be useful in changing the discourse around the queer community and queer rights, in altering Farrell's "public memory" and "social knowledge" that keep queer concerns and considerations out of "the norm." To ask more of allies might push the envelope, but we feel that allies should be shown the value in managing their own privilege, becoming uncomfortable, and sacrificing entitled space to afford a more balanced experience for the queer and trans communities they hope to ally.

Chapter VIII: Research Limitations and Further Study

Side by Side has offered one interpretation of the subject university's Safe Space manual in what it hopes will be a continued iterative process of the unspoken messages of the manual and its construction. We hope we have offered value in a review of the manual and its construction of "allyship" at this point in time. We recognize this process will always be incomplete, and offer the following limitations and suggestions for further study for Side by Side.

This study may treat allies and safe space interchangeably at times. This is not a stringently accurate representation of the two concepts. Allies may certainly be used to help create LGBTQIA+ community safe space, but allies are not strictly necessary for queer individuals or the LGBTQIA+ community to survive—safe physical and mental spaces are. In order to best understand the roles and functionings of allies, as opposed to safe spaces, in the health and flourishing of the LGBTQIA+ community, the two should be explored as separate factors.

Notably, there was a separation in this study of the manual from the actual live Safe Space training. To limit the focus of the study, and to account for a lack of "live" trainings during the COVID-19 pandemic, this project maintained that separation. Although effort was made to focus discussion on the manuals alone, inevitably, interview contributors spoke of their trainings or the interplay of a manual and its facilitation. Indeed, when asked if the manual alone could serve to accomplish the goals of a Safe Space training, the directors responded with a resounding "No," "not at all," "not close" (Directors A, I, and O). They repeatedly described the manual in terms of a tool only, a starting point, a supplement, or a part of a discussion or interaction. So, while Side by Side's separation is false in that the manual is most often intended to be used to facilitate a training, we have also discussed some director intent for manual use outside of a training, and postulated the manual may be encountered apart from a facilitated training. Even so, a study of the language used in actual training, as well as a review of the interplay of manual language with "live" training language (i.e. an actual training experience) would produce an examination of the construction of "ally" which is likely to diverge from the manual construction interpreted here.

In relation to the previous point, the singular investigator's reading cannot account for all interpretations of the manual that would arise from its reading. For instance, Director O described the division of the manual from a facilitated training:

> The challenge really is, when the manual stands on its own, each reader brings their own kind of limitations to the context within their reading of that content...in reading of that manual they're each bringing their own lived experiences that's shaped the already existing context within which they're reading that manual. So, their ability to have their perspective be shaped or reshaped is predicated on all of

> the context that's behind their reading. When it's held within an environment in which a conversation is being facilitated, you are expanding infinitely the context in which the reading occurs, because now you're not only bringing that person's lived experiences, but you're bringing the facilitator's experience, you're bringing other participants' experience to the reading or the understanding of that content and it just becomes that much more rich and that much more diverse.

While the investigator tried to give an objective reading of the manual and a fair evaluation of its constructions, he is similarly beholden to his past experiences and frameworks, and language is a notoriously subjective phenomenon. Likewise, while the investigator values intersectionality, consulted varied views, and worked to see through his own subjectivity, his own positioning and privilege as a white, cisgender male—the "homonormative gay"—in the U.S. is inescapable and may have affected his interpretations at times. Intersectional reevaluation of the study could only complicate and benefit its findings.

This study had access to three iterations of the "Safe Space" training manual for the subject university: the current iteration and the two previous manuals. Other manuals existed before these three, and influenced the composition of the three studied manuals. Access to all the manuals the university's LGBT Resource Center has used would better illuminate the treatment of "ally" through time and provide a more complete interpretation of the resource center's manuals. Likewise, two interview contributors were not involved directly with the three manuals under consideration. However, as revealed during the interviews, the most current manuals hold aspects of the initial manuals, as directors maintained research and ideas written into the manuals by the LGBT Resource Center's first full-time director. Some directors interviewed had access to the manuals they helped build or revise during their time with the LGBT Resource Center, and

some did not. While each director mentioned the threads of Director A's work running through their manuals, and there has been a building from one manual to the next in succession, some directors had to rely on memories of their own manuals. They offered their best recollections of their manual and their time as director, but in some cases many years have passed, and work in similar arenas since acting as the Center's director may have conflated memories.

While much of the directors' manuals and work was built off of Director A's program, Side by Side did not have access to a full, consecutive run of manuals nor directors since Director A. Exploration of each manual and access to each director's thoughts from the time period from Director A to the present would naturally expand and perhaps alter the interpretation of the evolution of the information present in the manual for this study.

In examining the construction of "ally" in LGBT resource center Safe Space manuals, this project studied a center at a regional, four-year university in the U.S. Midwest. Accurate extrapolation to more or less liberal or populated campuses, to community college or secondary campuses, and so forth, may be limited and should be explored in its own right.

A use of "intergroup" and "intragroup" allyship is suggested in Side by Side. As with many of the changes to language suggested in this study, "intergroup" and "intragroup" are suggested only as moves forward. As noted by Director O, "identities are incredibly complex," and clearly, as soon as one conceives of themself as an intragroup queer ally, they realize they are an intergroup ally to anyone outside their particular queer identity. The possibilities for actual intragroup allyship are miniscule—and indeed, one might ask if "intragroup allyship" isn't an oxymoron. However, the introduction of these terms to discussions of allyship raise our awareness of intersectionality and delimit the hetero- and homonormative conceptualizations this

study found to persist in the iterations of the Safe Space manual under review. Further study into more accurate language and theories of allyship is recommended.

Chapter IX: Conclusion

As we began Side by Side we posited three research questions:

1. How do university LGBT resource centers rhetorically construct concepts of "ally" in their audience through ally training manual language?

2. What rationale informs university LGBT resource center language and design of ally training manuals' construction of allyship?

3. What rhetorical theories can support and strengthen university LGBT resource centers' ally training manuals, and therefore, trainings?

In summary of our discussions of the manual and director interviews, Side by Side found the following answers to the research questions.

1. How do university LGBT resource centers rhetorically construct concepts of "ally" in their audience through ally training manual language?

Through examination of the manual and its structures, we found the use of a generally invitational rhetoric that affects a pathos of ally comfort, and often limits ally responsibility to

informing oneself as part of a constructive process of positioning, inviting, informing, instructing, and charging the ally. Through a pairing of audience address and ambiguous use of the term "ally," an ally is understood as a heteronormative and cisgender individual. Parts of speech that other the queer community in relation to the ally, and instruction given to the ally, generally support this interpretation. These constructions contribute to an ally understanding as intergroup, and, at times, as a savior to the LGBTQIA+ community. The construction of the intergroup ally disallows understandings of intragroup allyship, and broader understandings of queer and trans community complexities.

2. What rationale informs university LGBT resource center language and design of ally training manuals' construction of allyship?

Through discussion with four LGBT Resource Center directors of the subject university, our study found a desire to provide a welcoming environment to the ally, an earlier understanding of the ally as intergroup which persists, as well as a similarly outdated but persisting understanding of a reliance of the queer community on intergroup ally aid for safety.

3. What recommendations supported by rhetorical concepts can strengthen university LGBT resource centers' ally training manuals, and therefore, trainings?

As discussed in our previous "Recommendations" section, there are several adjustments we would suggest for the manual. The appropriateness of the suggested changes, and the development of more and/or alternative changes might be supported by a reevaluation of the manual and its "Rhetorical Situation" as theorized by Lloyd Bitzer. For instance, the direction of the manual and the concept of the ally might be reevaluated in light of a contemporary audience, exigence for the manual, or context and culture of LGBTQIA+ concerns. In the same vein, we recall Cooper's examination of "*actors...behaviors...people...ends...means*, and...*results*" in

analyzing the rhetorical situation unique to the training manual (46). Side by Side has attempted such an external evaluation in hindsight, but a proactive evaluation in planning new manual discourse might also prove fruitful internally for resource centers.

In closing out our study, we offer a review of some of its main concepts, and considerations from the director interview for consideration. As was indicated through the director interviews for this project, the Safe Space training for the LGBT Resource Center in question has been, and continues to be, evolving—Director Q adds, "the safe space training has evolved a lot over the years and I think that is exactly how it is [supposed] to be." We agree. Unfortunately, while the thinking around allies and the queer community has been changing, the manual tied to the resource center trainings has changed little—although the current center director recognizes this and plans change. In the majority of its address, the SSM creates of itself a space for non-queer individuals as allies without mention of intragroup allyship, addresses a majority non-queer audience, and maintains "ally" as an intergroup construction rather than opening the concept to intragroup allyship and diverse understandings of queer experiences and intersectionality. The current manual focuses on an invitational rhetoric that positions ally comfort before ally responsibility to the queer community.

Likewise, the current LGBT Resource Center manual builds a concept of identity alter to the queer community, an identity that through a pairing of invitational rhetoric and discussion of privilege without critical reflection on privilege, may not push hard enough to create meaningful change for intergroup allies. By not addressing the potential, and likelihood of queer community members in the audience, the manual misses opportunities for evolving the queer community's perception of its own makeup and intragroup allyship. Director I notes, "I don't think it's as punchy [the manual] as it could be, it's a little tame still." Here he is speaking of the manual's

work to change and expand the queer community's perception of itself, but this study would contend that his assessment applies to the manual overall. He also indicates, "The language in the manual, I think it oscillates between...I don't know if placating is the right word, but it does sometimes overly center the ally instead of the queer and trans community...we're even looking at redoing it again just because...it still feels like it centers those who hold power and privilege." As you see, the current director of the LGBT Resource Center is already focused on what we would put forward as the main consideration from the results of this study: it is time for the Safe Space manual to be updated to reflect and construct the concept of "ally" for trainees that has been evolving ever since Director A. A new iteration embodying safety and inclusion for the queer community itself, centering the queer community as suggested by Director I, and further recognizing the identities and intersectionalities possible within the queer community and queer community allyship is needed.

We illustrate this need in light of a comment from Director Q. Reflecting on any substantive changes she would make to her manual, she indicates, "Any sort of delusion to the savior mentality for the allies, I would definitely—that is my takeaway—definitely my takeaway." We suggest past iterations of the manual have created such an understanding through a presentation of intergroup allies as the manual audience, the positioning of intergroup allies in relation to the queer community in the manual, a certain lack of recognition of intragroup allies and intersectionality, instructions for allyship given to the (understood as non-queer) audience, and a limited address of privilege. Director I suggests a similar concern that the focus of some center efforts may need further tuning, suggesting the manual could be:

> Coming at it with a lens of centering queer and trans people and then working out from that. Making sure that language is about those who are oppressed but

> making sure that it doesn't dwell on the fact of the oppression...It's sort of seen as a band aid [the establishment of identity centers] instead of as a way to influence or alter the fabric, so I feel that sort of subconsciously that a lot of the things that us identity centers do still center those who are carrying power and privilege instead of centering those who are oppressed.

We agree it is indeed time to decenter the intergroup ally as the focus, and the hope, of queer discussions. A welcoming and an appreciation of intergroup allies need not mean a relinquishing of space to them, and the construction of "ally" in the Safe Space manual can help safeguard queer autonomy.

Self reports that "University LGBT Centers and the professional roles attached to such spaces are roughly 45-years old" (1), so discussions of allyship have been at work and evolving for some time. Maybe then, it is no longer a *construction* of allyship that is in need, as a concept already exists in public memory. Perhaps instead, it is time for a *new keying* of the concept, a process where "a systematic alteration is involved, one that will radically reconstitute what it is for them [those involved in previous and changing understandings] that is going on" (Goffman 45). As the allied and their valued allies come to new understandings of their relationship and the power dynamics that exist between them, it is time for the Safe Space manual to reflect such conversations, both in the topics it presents, and its address of readers and training participants.

In addition to a "recentering" of the focus of the manual, the manual itself can be recentered as a creator of meaning, even apart from a training. The directors maintain (and this study does not argue) that the Safe Space manual cannot achieve the goals of the Safe Space training on its own—that it is only a tool to aid in the facilitation of the training—however, the fact remains that the manual will be used as a reference outside of training as well. Whether it is

a participant referring back to the manual, sharing it or its information with a friend or group, or if the manual would become an internet resource in the future (a suggestion from Director O), the manual will guide understandings of "ally" away from a complete and facilitated training. For this reason—as well as fully leveraging the tool the manual can be—manual development of key concepts can contribute to the impact of a construction, and increase explicit intent.

Without explicit intent or nuanced definitions, we are left to implicit constructions. We expect one might argue just how much import an element like a preposition alone could carry, that it's simply how we speak and write. First, examination of the habitual ways in which we speak and write are worthwhile alone, but secondly—as we have alluded to throughout our discussion—it isn't a single constructive element of the manual that is problematic per se, but the interaction of a number of constructive elements and the rhetorical effect that they have on a reader—the implicit constructions of the manual. To address a non-queer audience, to position that audience apart from the queer community through prepositions and assertive imperatives, and to allow for topical reflection on one's privilege do become problematic as an interpretation of the ally and the exigence (or lack thereof) of queer and trans concerns.

Currently there seems to be a disconnect between director intent for the manual or a manual/training pairing, and what actually happens in the text of the manual. Some reasonably simple adjustments to language and short text additions could address such discrepancies. As we continue to complicate our understandings of identity, and as marginalized groups continue to marginalize marginalization itself, stepping determinedly forward into their own spaces, we will have to revisit Safe Space manuals, their constructions, and their lessons for allyship time and again. Side by Side hopes to be part of one iteration of that process, to be a part of Director O's "needling forward" toward a more empathetic and inclusive society as a whole.

For anyone born into privilege, wishing to advocate as an ally, the entry into that role might best serve as inquisitive, reflective, and humble. An intentional and rhetorically sophisticated approach to the construction of the "ally" identity by those leading one into allyship will help ensure the neophyte takes on the role with gravity. LGBT resources centers can design manuals and create meanings that consider concepts such as "alterity" or "space," and their relevance to allyship, that will influence rhetorical approaches. While these terms and ideas may not be presented to trainees per se, rumination over them by center leadership will ensure that the "ally" role does not exist in training manuals as petrified, but rather dynamic and able to respond to those harkening to its call—and especially able to respond to those the aspiring ally will serve.

Works Cited

Alcoff, Linda. "The Problem of Speaking for Others." *Cultural Critique*, no. 20, 1991, pp. 5-32.

Benjamin, Jessica. "Beyond Doer and Done To: An Intersubjective View of Thirdness." *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, vol. 73, no.1, 2004, pp. 5-46.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1992, pp. 1-14.

Blanchot, Maurice. *The Infinite Conversation*, Vol. 82, University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Broido, Ellen M. "The Development of Social Justice Allies during College: A Phenomenological Investigation." *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 41, no. 1, 2000, pp. 3-18.

Brookfield, Stephen D. *The Power of Critical Theory: Liberating Adult Learning and Teaching*, Jossey-Bass, 2004.

---. *Teaching for Critical Thinking: Tools and Techniques to Help Students Question their Assumptions*, John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

Brummett, Barry. "Rhetorical Methods in Critical Studies." *Rhetoric in Popular Culture*, SAGE, 2010, pp. 90-147.

Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*, University of California Press, 1966.

---. *A Rhetoric of Motives*, University of California Press, 1969.

Byrd, Rebekah, and Danica G. Hays. "Evaluating a Safe Space Training for School Counselors and Trainees Using a Randomized Control Group Design." *Professional School Counseling*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2013, pp. 20-31.

Cardon, Peter W. "*Business Communication: Developing Leaders for a Networked World,"* 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill, 2014, p. 154.

Coole, Diana. "Experiencing Discourse: Corporeal Communicators and the Embodiment of Power." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2007, pp. 413-433.

Cooper, Robert L. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "The Urgency of Intersectionality." *YouTube*, uploaded by TED, 7 Dec 2016, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=akOe5-UsQ2o.

Davis, Diane D. "Addressing Alterity: Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and the Nonappropriative Relation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, vol. 38, no. 3, 2005, pp. 191-212.

Farrell, Thomas. "Knowledge, Consensus, and Rhetorical Theory." *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, edited by John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill, The Guilford Press, 1999, pp. 140-152.

Fingerhut, Adam W. "Straight Allies: What Predicts Heterosexuals' Alliance with the LGBT Community?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 41, no. 9, 2011, pp. 2230-48.

Flores, Lisa A. "Creating Discursive Space through a Rhetoric of Difference: Chicana Feminists Craft a Homeland." *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* vol. 82, no. 2, 1996, pp. 142-56.

Foss, Sonja K., and Cindy L. Griffin. “Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric.” *Communications Monographs,* vol. 62, no. 1, 1995, pp. 2-18.

Fox, Catherine. “From Transaction to Transformation: (En)Countering White Heteronormativity in ‘Safe Spaces’.” *College English,* vol. 69, no. 5, 2007, pp. 496-511.

Gardner, Danielle M., and Jo M. Alanis. “Together We Stand: Ally Training for Discrimination and Harassment Reduction.” *Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* vol. 13, no .2, 2020, pp. 196-9.

German, Kathleen M. “Finding a Methodology for Rhetorical Criticism.” *National Forensic Journal*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1985, pp. 86-101.

Gill, Ann M., and Karen Whedbee. “Rhetoric.” *Discourse as Structure and Process,* edited by Teun A. Van Dijk, Vol. 1, Sage, 1997, pp. 157-84.

Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Northeastern University Press, 1986.

Grzanka, Patrick R., et al. “Making Up Allies: The Identity Choreography of Straight LGBT Activism.” *Sexuality Research and Social Policy,* vol. 12, no. 3, 2015, pp. 165-81.

Hampton, Timothy. “‘Turkish Dogs’: Rabelais, Erasmus, and the Rhetoric of Alterity.” *Representations,* vol. 41, 1993. pp. 58-82.

Hartal, Gilly. “Fragile Subjectivities: Constructing Queer Safe Spaces.” *Social & Cultural Geography*, vol. 19, no. 8, 2018, pp. 1053-72.

Ji, Peter, Steve N. Du Bois, and Patrick Finnessy. “An Academic Course that Teaches Heterosexual Students to Be Allies to LGBT Communities: A Qualitative Analysis.” *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services,* vol. 21, no .4, 2009, pp. 402-29.

Kearns, Laura-Lee, Jennifer Mitton-Kukner, and Joanne Tompkins. "LGBTQ Awareness and Allies: Building Capacity in a Bachelor of Education Program." *Canadian Journal of Education*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2014, pp. 1-26.

"LGBT resource center." *Wikipedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_student_center. Accessed 17 Oct. 2020.

McGlashan, Hayley, and Katie Fitzpatrick. "LGBTQ Youth Activism and School: Challenging Sexuality and Gender Norms." *Health Education*, vol. 117, no. 5, 2017, pp. 485-97.

Philipsen, Gerry. "Speaking 'Like a Man' in Teamsterville: Culture Patterns of Role Enactment in an Urban Neighborhood." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 61, no. 1, 1975, pp. 13-22.

Poynter, Kerry John, and Nancy Jean Tubbs. "Safe Zones: Creating LGBT Safe Space Ally Programs." *Journal of LGBT Youth*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2008, pp. 121-32.

Reason, Robert D., and Ellen M. Broido. "Issues and Strategies for Social Justice Allies (and the Student Affairs Professionals Who Hope to Encourage Them)." *New Directions for Student Services*, no. 110, 2005, pp. 81-89.

Self, Jen M. "Queering Center: A Critical Discourse Analysis of University LGBT Center Theoretical Foundations." *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2015, pp.1-40.

Sullivan, Dale L. "A Closer Look at Education as Epideictic Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 23, no. 3-4, 1994, pp. 70-89.

Wacker, Robbyn. "It's Time: Defining the New Regional Comprehensive University." *St. Cloud State TODAY*, 6 July 2020, https://today.stcloudstate.edu/its-time-defining-the-new-regional-comprehensive-university/. Accessed 17 Oct. 2020.

Woodford, Michael R., et al. "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Ally Training Programs

on Campus: Current Variations and Future Directions." *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 55, no. 3, 2014, pp. 317-22.

Appendices

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

ally: an individual working for the benefit of one outside of their own positioning; used here when appropriate to both intragroup and intergroup allyship

alterity: rhetorical concept exploring communication between the "self" and the "other"

consubstantial: inherently separate by identity, but united by group identity and goal (Burke)

identity choreography: construction of one's identity from a "dance" between any number of previous experiences from one's own life (Grzanka et al.)

identity construction: the creation of the concept of one's positioning, skills, and responsibilities in a new role (ally); here, generally by an outside force

intergroup ally: a member of one group, aiding a member or cause of another group (e.g. a straight individual aiding a queer cause)

intersectionality: the synthesis of effects resulting from an identity composed of more than a single marginalized positioning, e.g. a lesbian woman of color will experience the effects of being queer in our society, as well as the effects of being Native American (for instance) in our society

intragroup ally: a member of one group aiding another member of the same umbrella group, although their individual identities under the umbrella differ (e.g. an intersex individual aiding a bisexual individual, although both fall under the "queer" umbrella)

LGBTQIA+: acronym intended to capture the many identities belonging to the queer community as a referent (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Intersex, Asexual/Ally, including but not limited to)

queer: describing an individual or cause related to the LGBTQIA+ community; used here as a positive, inclusive, reclaimed term free of bias, negative connotation, or hate

Appendix B: LGBT Resource Center Director Interview

(2.) During interviews with the directors, the directors were asked the following questions from seven categories. Latitude was also allowed for the development of organic conversation. The directors were asked to return to their mindset, as best as possible, of the time when they were developing the Safe Space manual/s.

A. Director background

1. *When were you director of the LGBT Resource Center at the university?*
2. *What was the popular attitude toward the LGBTQIA+ community during your tenure?*
3. *How would you describe the interplay between queer community members and allies during your tenure?*
4. *To which manuals did you contribute?*
5. *Did you write any manual text, or choose its samplings from the sources cited within it? How were you involved?*

B. Language constructing or in discussion of the ally or ally community

1. *What were your feelings toward the word/concept "ally" during your tenure as director?*
2. *"Ally" often seems an ambiguous term in the manual. Please comment on any intentionality of this construction.*
3. *Ideally, what role did you intend allies to assume in a training?*
4. *How did you intend the construction of the SSM to guide a participant's concept of "ally"?*
5. *Who was the ally in your mind (background, motivations, intra- or inter-, etc.)*
6. *What would be the expectations, responsibilities, and understanding of "ally" of an individual exiting an experience with your manual?*
7. *Note the inclusive "ally" definition in the manual's glossary (1,2:27;3:absent),* "Someone who confronts heterosexism, homophobia, biphobia, transphobia, heterosexual and gender-straight privilege in themselves and others; a concern for the well-being of lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans* people; and a belief that heterosexism, homophobia, biphobia and transphobia are social justice issues." *Do you feel this broad definition of "ally" was intended, was reflected, throughout the manual?*

   If you worked on manual 3, why was this definition removed?

C. Audience for the Safe space manual

1. *Who do you expect to make up the majority of the audience at a Safe Space training?*
2. *If I were to say I feel the SSMs have heteronormative/cisgender/non-queer individuals as the audience, how would you respond?*

D. The queer individual as intragroup ally

1. Are the manuals designed to catalyze a change in queer individuals' perceptions of the LGBTQIA+ community?
2. Did you intend the SSM to address queer intragroup allies in its discussion of allies?

E. Language constructing queer community, ally and manual relationships

1. *Were efforts made to position the queer individual as autonomous from, or dependent on, allies in the manual?*
2. *Do you feel the manual ever positions the ally as empowered and offering salvation to the queer community?*
3. *Do you feel the queer individual is "othered" in the manuals?*
4. *At times queer individuals are referred to as "these people," the participant is guided to do things "to" or "for" a queer individual or the queer community, or they are instructed to "validate," or "include" a queer individual or community. Can you comment on these constructions in building a participant's concept of the ally?*

5. *The address of the manual rarely, if ever, positions itself as a "we" with the queer community. Please comment on this positioning of the "narrator."*

F. Language addressing privilege and responsibility

1. *The manuals open with an invitation to "Participate to your own comfort level." Please discuss any intent, or implications, for an ally you see in this invitation.*
2. *Participants are certainly* informed *of heteronormativity and cisgender privilege in the manual. Did you intend for participants to* reflect *on how they might experience the benefits of either of these conditions?*

G. Intent for the Safe Space training manual and its construction

1. *Were individuals from outside the queer community involved in manual construction?*
2. *What was your main goal for the safe Space training manual?*
3. *Is there one substantive change you would make to the manual if you were directing the4 Center and its training now? Why?*
4. *Do you feel the manual alone can achieve all the goals of the Safe Space training?*
5. *Do you feel you consciously used the language/ideas discussed today (or others) to guide the manifestation of "ally" brought about by the manuals?*

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

Side by Side: Allyship's Rhetorical Construction in University LGBT Resource Center "Safe Space" Training Manuals

Researcher	Research Advisor
Chad Kuehn	Dr. Dan Wildeson
Department of English	Director, Center for Holocaust and Genocide Education
Webster Hall 252	Professor, Department of Communication Studies
(651) 497-1477	Miller Center 235
ctkuehn@stcloudstate.edu	(320) 308-4205
	dlwildeson@stcloudstate.edu

Project: In this interview, we will explore LGBT Resource Center director intentions in the construction of the Center's "Safe Space" training manual, and its construction of the "ally" identity. The researcher is inviting you to participate in an interview response activity to cover your thoughts of the intent behind the "ally" concept in training manuals. The research will allow LGBT Resource Centers to examine the language of their own manuals, and reflect upon the intent of their own manual design. The interview is expected to last about one-two hours.

- ☐ This is NOT a critique of your conceptualization of the term, nor of your performance as current/former center director, and there are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to you.
- ☐ Your name will NOT be used in data analysis and report.
- ☐ If you do not participate, your relationship with the researcher/university will NOT change.
- ☐ The research results may be presented or published.
- ☐ There is no reward for contributing to the study.
- ☐ **Your participation is voluntary. You may withdraw at any time.**

If you are interested in the study results, the researcher can share that information with you when it is available. Please contact the researcher (contacts above). Upon completion of the project, the research will be published in the St. Cloud State University Repository.

Confidentiality: During the interview, you may refuse to answer any of the interview questions you do not wish to answer. Only the researcher will have access to your responses in connection to your name. Your responses will NEVER be used with your name, and any of your responses published will ONLY be done so with your approval. The researcher will hold Zoom recordings of your interview until the completion of his thesis, and then destroy the recordings.

Questions and Concerns: If you have general questions about the research, you may contact the researcher (contacts above). If you have concerns about the researcher or his methods, you may withdraw from the research and/or contact the faculty advisor (Dr. Wildeson, contacts above).

If you give permission to use your data for research, please sign below.

Name in Print ....._____ **Date**…..…….. _____

Signature ....._____

Appendix D: Audio/Visual Recording Release Form

Project Title:
Side by Side: Allyship's Rhetorical Construction in University LGBT Resource Center "Safe Space" Training Manuals

Primary Investigator:
Chad Kuehn

Primary Investigator's Email Address:
ctkuehn@stcloudstate.edu

Supervising Investigator's Name:
Dr. Dan Wildeson

Supervising Investigator's Email Address:
dlwildeson@stcloudstate.edu

This form asks for your consent to use media for and from this study. We would like you to indicate how we can use your media. Below is a list of media types that we will use. Please initial where you consent for each type of use of your media. Legal representative initials will provide consent when needed.

Regardless of your answers on the next page, you will not be penalized.

We will not use your media in any way you have not initialed.

Questions regarding this form should be directed to the researchers. Additional answers can be found by contacting the IRB Administrator or an IRB Committee Member. Current membership is available at:
https://www.stcloudstate.edu/irb/members.aspx

A copy of this form will be provided for your records.

Please Print:

_____
Participant Name

_____
Legal Representative if Applicable

Video with audio (Zoom recording)	
Consent Granted	Type of Release
	Used by research team to record and analyze data

Transcription of audio	
Consent Granted	Type of Release
	Used by research team to record and analyze data

	Published or presented in an academic outlet (e.g., journal, conference)

I have read the above carefully and give my consent only for those items which I initialed.

_____ _____
Participant Signature (if 18 years of age or older) Date

_____
Participant Name (Printed)

WHEN CONSENT IS NEEDED FROM A LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE, COMPLETE THIS SECTION. UP TO TWO LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE MAY SIGN.

_____ _____
Legal Representative Signature Date

_____
Legal Representative Name (Printed)

_____ _____
Second Legal Representative Signature Date

_____
Second Legal Representative Name (Printed)

Appendix E: IRB Approval Form

ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY
EDUCATION FOR LIFE.

Institutional Review Board (IRB)
720 4th Avenue South AS 210, St. Cloud, MN 56301-4498

Name: Chad Kuehn

Email: ctkuehn@stcloudstate.edu

IRB PROTOCOL DETERMINATION: Exempt Review

Project Title: Side-by-side: The Rhetorical Construction of Allyship in University LGBT Resource Center Safe Space Training Manuals

Advisor Dan Wildeson

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed your protocol to conduct research involving human subjects. Your project has been: **APPROVED**

Please note the following important information concerning IRB projects:

- The principal investigator assumes the responsibilities for the protection of participants in this project. Any adverse events must be reported to the IRB as soon as possible (ex. research related injuries, harmful outcomes, significant withdrawal of subject population, etc.).

- For expedited or full board review, the principal investigator must submit a Continuing Review/Final Report form in advance of the expiration date indicated on this letter to report conclusion of the research or request an extension.

-Exempt review only requires the submission of a Continuing Review/Final Report form in advance of the expiration date indicated in this letter if an extension of time is needed.

- Approved consent forms display the official IRB stamp which documents approval and expiration dates. If a renewal is requested and approved, new consent forms will be officially stamped and reflect the new approval and expiration dates.

- The principal investigator must seek approval for any changes to the study (ex. research design, consent process, survey/interview instruments, funding source, etc.). The IRB reserves the right to review the research at any time.

If we can be of further assistance, feel free to contact the IRB at 320-308-4932 or email ResearchNow@stcloudstate.edu and please reference the SCSU IRB number when corresponding.

IRB Chair:

Dr. Mili Mathew
Chair and Graduate Director
Assistant Professor
Communication Sciences and Disorders

IRB Institutional Official:

María-Claudia Tomany

Dr. Claudia Tomany
Associate Provost for Research
Dean of Graduate Studies

OFFICE USE ONLY

SCSU IRB# 1874 - 2607	**Type:** Exempt Review	**Today's Date:** 1/20/2021
1st Year Approval Date: 1/20/2021	**2nd Year Approval Date:**	**3rd Year Approval Date:**
1st Year Expiration Date:	**2nd Year Expiration Date:**	**3rd Year Expiration Date:**